

BOOK II

CONGRESSIONAL REACTIONS

This book includes Statements by Members of Congress as follows:

- Tab A - 6 May Statement by Senator Johnson (Congressional Record)
- Tab B - 8 May Remarks by Senator Case on ABC-TV, and by
Representative Bowles on NBC radio.
- Tab C - 9 May Statement by Senators Johnson, Dirksen and others
(Congressional Record)
- Tab D - 9 May Remarks by Senator Mansfield and other (Congressional Record)
- Tab E - 10 May Remarks by Senator Hruska (Congressional Record)
- Tab F - 9 May Remarks by Representative Loser (Congressional Record)
- Tab G - 9 May Remarks by Representative Bowles (Congressional Record)
- Tab H - 10 May Statement by Representative Cannon (Congressional Record)
- Tab I - Floor Statements by Congress, chronologically beginning 12 May

- Tab J - Press Statement by Congressmen
8 May
9 May
10 May
- Tab K - Congressional Record (Extension of Remarks)

TAB

CONFIDENTIAL

MAY 6 1960

SHOOTING DOWN OF U.S. PLANE IN
THE TURKISH REGION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am deeply troubled by Premier Khrushchev's statement, on yesterday, concerning the shooting down of a one-man, unarmed American weather plane.

Mr. President, the Government of the Soviet Union is a sovereign government, and it must be respected as such. But men of good will do not act in this fashion just before important peace talks are about to begin.

Premier Khrushchev may well have thought the flight of the plane was a deliberate intrusion on our part. If that were even a remote possibility, we, too, should be taken to task for allowing it just before the summit meeting, or at any other time.

But how much better it would have been if Premier Khrushchev had chosen to discuss his apprehension openly and frankly.

Mr. President, it is time that we talked more openly about these things. It has been the Soviet habit to perpetuate crises in an attempt to force negotiations or to influence the outcome of conferences. Such tactics will not work with America, nor could we expect them to work with Russia.

The Russian people are courageous and brave. They love and honor their homeland. Both they and we fought the Nazis in World War II.

But, Mr. President, lest the world forget, we Americans have a deep and unshakable belief in our country and its institutions; and I would remind the world that Americans are not afraid. We intend to continue to walk among the nations of the world with strength and with honor and with dignity.

Great nations, as with great men, can dwell in peace only if they share honor and mutual respect.

No talks, either long or short, on Berlin, on disarmament, or on nuclear test bans, can be expected to really produce unless good will also sits with the nations at the conference.

I do not wish to be misunderstood, Mr. President. The world has had enough of saber rattling. America is strong today, and we shall continue to keep America strong. Rocket threats will not produce peace.

These are simply statements of fact.

Premier Khrushchev loves his country. He says he believes in his system. He says, "We want peace, but we do not want to beg for it."

Mr. President, he must afford us the same honor and respect.

We are more than willing to talk peace with him, to attempt to iron out our difficulties. It must be done in an atmosphere of quiet dignity, good will, and mutual respect. That is what we in America have tried to do. That is what our distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee does each day. I remember his telling me of the conference he had with some important representatives of the Soviet Union just a few days ago, and I think it is worth repeating: That this Nation feels we can do this in an atmosphere of dignity, good will, and mutual respect, but America will not be coerced.

Let us tell the world this, and let us hope that we understand one another better.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, first, I wish to compliment the majority leader on a very fine statement, and I hope that it will be taken seriously by the leader of the Soviet Union.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator. The Senator from Arkansas is a constant inspiration to me, and I try to emulate the example he sets.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator.

**Remarks of Senator Clifford Case - on College News Conference at 1:00 P.M.
8 May 1960 on ABC-TV Network.**

This was removed and attached to Memorandum for the Director.

TAB

Meet the Press at 6:35 P.M. over WRCA (New York) and the
NBC Radio Network:

Guest: Cong. Chester Bowles, Dem. of Connecticut.

Moderator: Ned Brooks.

Panel: Peter Lisagor, Chicago Daily News
Chalmers Roberts, Washington Post
John Steele, Time & Life Magazines
Frank Bourgholtzer, NBC News.

BROOKS: "Now, Congressman Bowles, if you are ready, we'll start the questions with Mr. Bourgholtzer."

BOURGHOLTZER: "Mr. Bowles, if you were foreign political advisor to a President rather than a candidate, what would you advise him in this situation where an American pilot has been shot down by the Russians and has admitted being a spy--would you advise this admitting that he was a spy, as has been done?"

BOWLES: "This is a--that--you've asked a very tough one. I--it seems to me that the administration did all they could with a very very difficult, very unpleasant and highly embarrassing situation. It's pretty clear that Mr. Khrushchev knew it was going on and he appears to have the evidence which he could confront the world and presumably persuade the world. I think it would have only made a bad situation--I think it is a very bad situation--worse if we tried to cover it up."

BOURGHOLTZER: "One the same question there, there are a lot of aspects, but I'm wondering particularly what your viewpoint would be, particularly thinking of the upcoming administration, to the point of the President being unaware of such an activity, as apparently in the case of this incident. Do you think the President should be kept purposely unaware of certain intelligence operations?"

BOWLES: "Well, I--let's start with the fact that I believe this will go down in history as probably the most embarrassing and shocking occurrence of the last seven or eight years. It's terribly embarrassing, difficult; it's put us in a very bad situation before the world. We are going to hear a lot more of it. I wish I were talking about two or three days from now, where perhaps we'd have a better chance to settle down and think it through and certainly, as I say, I want to have--be sure it's very responsible and thoughtful, because no one has any desire to make this worse--certainly not for partisan reasons.

"But it seems to me the whole situation's placed the State Department in the position of having deliberately told a falsehood. We assume they did not know the actual facts, that these facts are simply given. As you go on to say, the President himself is placed in a position of not appearing to know a very major development in regard to our foreign policy. The Soviet Union were encouraged to be suspicious of us--they are already very suspicious on this whole matter of controls and inspections.

"They've always charged that the reason we want this inspection is to--for spying work and espionage generally. They also have been granted a beautiful opportunity to use this--and they'll use it certainly very adroitly--to embarrass us and to weaken our already weak position as we approach the summit and the whole world has been given a very deep contrast between our apparent desire for peace,

our desire to try to negotiate a peace while carrying on this kind of activity almost simultaneously. I think it's a very bad situation."

BROOKS: "Mr. Steele."

STEELE: "Mr. Bowles, I want to get one thing straight, are you criticizing the activities of the plane or are you criticizing the pilot getting caught?"

BOWLES: "Well, let me say this, I don't think any one of us--as simply an outsider, a newspaper reader, as I am, can know what is essential here in a way of espionage. We are all realists. We all know that this is a difficult and complex world. We all know we're at a disadvantage, that the Soviet as a closed police state has certain very great advantages over us.

"However, it seems to me that that's not really the point here. The point is the timing. This may be necessary under certain circumstances, depending, of course, on the technical problems and how great our lack of knowledge really is. But the point is, we are preparing for a summit meeting. The whole history of the world may depend on our ability to negotiate with the Soviet Union, to talk with them on a basis of mutual trust or a least some greater degree of mutual trust. By timing this particular excursion at this particular time, we have certainly gone a long way to undermine that hope."

STEELE: "Well, now, let's see if I understand. You mean these activities are all right except when we have an international meeting, is that correct?"

BOWLES: "I don't know that they're all right at all, Mr. Steele, because I don't know the inside story of how much information we have, what we lack, or what risks should be required to get it. I would assume that we should not do this sort of thing for marginal gain, only if the gain was so very, very vital to our security it could be justified on the basis of our national security--the utmost degree.

"But the point is here--we're in a very delicate position, and certainly this would be a time to be far more circumspect than obviously these people have been. I think they have committed a very gross case of misjudgement, and I think it's highly reckless and I think it's dangerous and hurtful."

STEELE: "Mr. Bowles, you are the foreign political advisor to Senator Kennedy, and presumably would become the Secretary of State if he's elected President."

BOWLES: "I wouldn't presume that for one minute."

STEELE: "You would not presume it?"

BOWLES "No."

STEELE: "Nevertheless--"

BOWLES: "That's a possibility."

STEELE: "Nevertheless, there has been talk of keeping the candidates informed about developments in foreign policy. Have you been kept informed as to these flights, either as Senator Kennedy's foreign political advisor or as a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee?"

BOWLES: "No, I had not heard of them. I have not been kept advised in any way, and I doubt that he has. I'm very sure that none of us have."

TAB

1960

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

9101

what can be done about it, and he answers: "As long as the Communists stay outside our 3-mile limit, all we can do is grit our teeth." By law, the high seas are free for any nation to use.

The U.S. Navy, of course, does keep as sharp an eye as it can on Communist maneuvering. "Hunter-killer" search forces constantly survey the sea lanes. But this is not enough, say U.S. Navy men. What they would like is a burglar alarm system—a very expensive undersea sonar fence—that would keep tab on all Soviet submarines in peacetime, with the implied warning that any warlike move would mean sudden death.

This is still in the dream stage. For now, American officers caution, this country should brace itself for more Soviet submarine activity and bigger and faster trawlers operating near America's home waters, and all around the world, spying out data that would be helpful in an attack on the United States itself.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I wish to join the Senator from Connecticut in congratulating the distinguished majority leader on his extremely statesmanlike utterance. I know that he speaks for the people of the United States when he says they will not allow this incident to divide our country.

Of course it is regrettable that the incident occurred on the very eve of the summit conference, because it does give to Soviet Russia an opportunity to "explode a propaganda bomb," and perhaps places us at some psychological disadvantage.

However, I see no reason why this incident should endanger the hopes which all of us have for the forthcoming summit conference. As the majority leader has said, if ever we needed to act toward achieving a reduction of the tensions which exist in the world, we must act to do so now.

Also, we must appraise this incident realistically. As the distinguished minority leader has said, spying is nothing new in the world. It is a recognized and accepted fact of life in the situation in which the world finds itself. Soviet planes engage in it regularly. They have flown over parts of Alaska, northern Canada, Japan, and other Western defense areas. As a matter of fact, Soviet spying has been a more expanded and intense operation than ours, because their spies have infiltrated into every area of the free world, whereas the Iron Curtain has impeded and handicapped our securing intelligence information. Of course, many more Russian spies have been caught than have Americans or those from other countries.

Finally, the circumstances surrounding this episode would never have existed if Russia had accepted the President's "open skies" proposal of several years ago.

I am more pleased than I can say to hear our distinguished majority leader stand up here in the way he has and express himself as he has. Knowing him as I do, it is the exact manner in which I would have expected him to act.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to commend the majority leader and other Senators who have spoken today in defense of our country. A number of us were serving in the other body when Pearl Harbor occurred. Following that episode, an investigation was moved, and a committee was established to investigate why Pearl Harbor had happened and why our armed services did not know more about it.

I think our armed services should be commended for finding out what is going on in the world.

In our cities we have fire inspectors going around, without our referring to them as spying. If the police forces give due attention to suspicious characters, nobody accuses them of spying.

Our Armed Forces are charged with a grave responsibility—the preservation of this Republic; and if we are not faced with a serious threat, then we are wasting about \$40 billion a year, trying to defend ourselves.

I for one do not think we should shake and quake in our boots every time Khrushchev and his gang do not like what is going on. They never give the world an accurate story of it; and we should say, as a great patriot did, "Our country! May she always be in the right, but our country, right or wrong!"

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. I, too, desire to join in the complimentary remarks the majority leader has made. I have never found him wanting. I believe that he is made of the mettle that makes America great.

I wish to say that while I have been interviewed several times, as a general rule I have refrained from remarks; but in this particular instance I spoke very definitely. First, I do not believe it is going to hurt the summit conference to have the facts about this incident disclosed.

Khrushchev has known all the time, the leaders who are to sit down at the table at the summit conference have known all the time, that Khrushchev has been playing a great international game of poker, and that we have certainly had our planes and our armed forces in Europe with an object. As has been suggested, that object has been that we shall not be caught again as we were at Pearl Harbor.

It was the privilege of some of us to be in a special meeting yesterday and we were briefed. What was said or done, of course, is not for me to say, but I came out of that meeting with the thought, "Thank God it has been demonstrated, to me at least, that we are alert, and not asleep."

Mr. President, there appeared in the paper this morning the text of a statement issued by Secretary Herter. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in

the RECORD following these brief words of mine.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 10, 1960]

TEXT OF STATEMENT ON PLANE

On May 7 the Department of State spokesman made a statement with respect to the alleged shooting down of an unarmed American civilian aircraft of the U-2 type over the Soviet Union. The following supplements and clarifies this statement as respects the position of the U.S. Government.

Ever since Marshal Stalin shifted the policy of the Soviet Union from wartime cooperation to postwar conflict, in 1946, and particularly since the Berlin blockade, the forceful takeover of Czechoslovakia and the Communist aggressions in Korea and Vietnam, the world has lived in a state of apprehension with respect to Soviet intentions. The Soviet leaders have almost complete access to the open societies of the free world and supplement this with vast espionage networks. However, they keep their own society tightly closed and rigorously controlled.

With the development of modern weapons carrying tremendously destructive nuclear warheads, the threat of surprise attack and aggression presents a constant danger. This menace is enhanced by the threats of mass destruction frequently voiced by the Soviet leadership.

IKE PROPOSAL CITED

For many years the United States in company with its allies has sought to lessen or even to eliminate this threat from the life of man so that he can go about his peaceful business without fear. Many proposals to this end have been put up to the Soviet Union. The President's "open skies" proposal of 1955 was followed in 1957 by the offer of an exchange of ground observers between agreed military installations in the United States, the U.S.S.R. and other nations that might wish to participate.

For several years we have been seeking the mutual abolition of the restrictions on travel imposed by the Soviet Union and those which the United States felt obliged to institute on a reciprocal basis.

More recently at the Geneva Disarmament Conference the United States has proposed far-reaching new measures of controlled disarmament. It is possible that the Soviet leaders have a different version and that, however unjustified, they fear attack from the West. But this is hard to reconcile with their continual rejection of our repeated proposals for effective measures against surprise attack and for effective inspection of disarmament measures.

RESPONSIBILITY NOTED

I will say frankly that it is unacceptable that the Soviet political system should be given an opportunity to make secret preparations to face the free world with the choice of abject surrender or nuclear destruction. The Government of the United States would be derelict to its responsibility not only to the American people but the free peoples everywhere if it did not, in the absence of Soviet cooperation, take such measures as are possible unilaterally to lessen and to overcome this danger of surprise attack. In fact the United States has not and does not shirk this responsibility.

In accordance with the National Security Act of 1947, the President has put into effect since the beginning of his administration directives to gather by every possible means the information required to protect the United States and the free world against surprise attack and to enable them to make effective preparations for their defense.

Under these directives programs have been developed and put into operation which have included extensive aerial surveillance by unarmed civilian aircraft, normally of a peripheral character but on occasion by penetration.

Specific missions of these unarmed civilian aircraft have not been subject to Presidential authorization. The facts that such surveillance was taking place has apparently not been a secret to the Soviet leadership and the question indeed arises as to why at this particular juncture they should seek to exploit the present incident as a propaganda battle in the cold war.

This Government had sincerely hoped and continues to hope that in the coming meeting of the heads of government in Paris Chairman Khrushchev will be prepared to cooperate in agreeing to effective measures which would remove this fear of sudden mass destruction from the minds of people everywhere.

Far from being damaging to the forthcoming meeting in Paris, this incident should serve to underline the importance to the world of an earnest attempt there to achieve agreed and effective safeguards against surprise attack and aggression.

At my request and with the authority of the President, the director of the Central Intelligence Agency, the Honorable Allen W. Dulles, is today briefing members of the Congress fully along the foregoing lines.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I could not refrain from expressing my appreciation to the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Texas, for the dispassionate, considered remarks he has made in the Senate this morning. The majority leader can, at the proper time and place, be a loyal, skillful, and adroit majority partisan, and I do not approach him for that ability. I admire him for it. But at a time like this, it is of inestimable benefit to the Senate and to the country when the majority leader takes the floor and, without appeal to partisanship, and without attempting to capitalize on any phase of the incident, counsels prudence and the path of care in seeing that the welfare of our country is guarded.

I shall take his advice and I congratulate the distinguished majority leader for the tenor and tone of his remarks this morning.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I should like to address a short remark to the majority leader.

While the majority leader and I do not always see eye to eye on partisan politics and political matters, I think he knows full well the great respect which I have for him and the extremely high regard in which I hold him. I know of no man in the Congress with greater ability. I know of no man in the Congress with greater loyalty to his country, to its security and to its progress than the majority leader.

The remarks of the majority leader this morning are the remarks of a truly great leader who is interested in his country and who, on an occasion when his country is definitely and deeply involved, not only can now but also has in the past risen completely above any partisan or political motivation. His re-

marks this morning are apt and to the point, and should be taken to heart by all Americans.

I am not completely and thoroughly conversant with all phases of our activities in the military and in other services in this country, but I believe, Mr. President, that I have had in the past several years my full share of exposure to what has to be done by the United States and by those responsible for its security.

I agree that all of us should be very careful at this time of tension not to express too vigorous an opinion in one way or another. Tensions in the world are very great. They can either be fanned or they can be quieted. A great deal depends upon the circumspection with which we, the people of the United States, in addition to the leaders of the political parties and of the administration, approach these problems. We, the people of the United States, I think, should exercise caution, calmness, and deliberation in these matters.

I received a letter this morning from a very worthy lady in my home State, who was very critical. She said, "What business have we 'monkeying around' even the edges of Russia? Why do we not let them alone? And then they will let us alone." I happen to know this lady. There is no finer lady in my State and none more well meaning. However, I will say she is completely devoid of any understanding of the constant and almost overpowering menace which threatens the freedom of the United States and of the free world every minute of every day, emanating from Communist aggression and Communist expansion. We must understand that if we in this country are to be able to intelligently and adequately prepare ourselves and to put ourselves in a position of security against surprise, we must know what is going on.

There are people in the country today who, I think, rather precipitously and unwarrantedly, are criticizing in this situation. I say, Mr. President, that if a sneak attack should occur on this country today, these are the very people who would want to hang the people who had neglected to find out what was going on in the world. The security of the United States is paramount.

I wish to suggest one other thing. The continuous and uninterrupted and unprecedented espionage activities of the Communist Iron Curtain countries and of Russia in this country have gone on and have been reported to the American people for years and years. I could recite detail after detail, instance after instance, of the most flagrant espionage in this country, the most flagrant invasion of what we might call the sovereignty and the security of this country on the part of the Communist aggressors.

I merely want to say again, without drawing out the discussion at this time, that I compliment the majority leader on his very fine statement, on his statesmanlike approach, on his calmness, and on his interest in the broad best interests of the security of this country. I caution that we, as the American people, must not become too emotional about

this matter, but must consider it with calmness until we know all the facts and until we know exactly what we are talking about. There are many things involved in this situation which are not at this point clear.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I want to express my appreciation to the Senator for his undeserved comments. The Senator knows of the great admiration and respect I have for him and have had since my first association with the Senator, when he was my chairman and I was a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and how deeply I appreciate his expression this morning.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I assure the Senator that everything I have said was from the heart. I mean it. I thank the Senator from Texas.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I should like to join my colleagues in paying respect to our distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] for his well timed remarks just given and the advice contained therein. Those of us who have had the privilege of serving with the Senator from Texas recognize him as a worthy opponent on any partisan question. However, we likewise know that on questions concerning the security or the defense of our country, he speaks as an American and not as a partisan.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Delaware. I value his friendship more than he knows.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I had in mind making a comment this morning about the so-called spy plane incident and in that connection I was told about the remarks of the majority leader. Though I did not hear them, I have just had an opportunity to read them, and I find they are a splendid contribution to this discussion. They go to what I had in mind to say this morning rather clearly, because I, too, feel, as the majority leader did, that this incident will turn out to be perhaps not as bad as we thought, and perhaps it will help rather than hurt us in the situation.

First, to make my remarks clean cut, I compliment the majority leader on the statesmanship which goes into keeping one's head when it would be easy to seek a partisan advantage, which might be momentarily attractive but would not contribute to our country's position in the world, and I join in complimenting the majority leader, for whom I have a high regard, as he and everyone else knows.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to express to the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] my gratitude, though I feel I deserve no compliment for doing what any Member of the Senate under similar circumstances would do. I merely said that America must be all for one and one for all, and we cannot allow any threats or propaganda moves to divide our people at this difficult hour. I believe all Americans subscribe to that doctrine.

Mr. JAVITS. When the majority says it as the leader of the opposition to the party of the administration, it means

1960

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

9103

more than mere words. I think we are quite right in being pleased that he spoke as he did at this juncture.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I appreciate the statement of my friend from New York. He knows of my high regard for him and my deep friendship for him.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, second thoughts on the U-2 spy plane incident now show that its effect will be the reverse of what Chairman Khrushchev intended. The first flash of Mr. Khrushchev's theatricals has now worn off and reasonable men and women in the free world will have these things in mind. First, Mr. Khrushchev shows again that he wants to keep the world in the anxious seat rather than to calm its nerves. This is hardly a peace campaign or preparation for serious negotiation at the summit. Second, Mr. Khrushchev's rocket threats against Norway and Pakistan—so reminiscent of Suez in 1956—are hardly compatible with a just world secure in the opportunity for debate and the resolution of tensions through international law and negotiation. Third, the incident again recalls the unwillingness of Khrushchev to agree to President Eisenhower's open skies proposal which in turn shows American willingness to abandon secrecy and to insure the world against surprise attack. Fourth, Mr. Khrushchev highlights the danger of surprise attack and fixes attention upon the capability of one man in the Communist dictatorship by a sudden decision to plunge the world into an abyss of A- and H-bomb war.

Adult people will remember the spy networks of the U.S.S.R. which have operated for 40 years in the free world and the names of Klaus Fuchs, Pontecorvo, Igor Gouzenko, Gerhardt Eisler, and Colonel Abel. There is also evidence of U.S.S.R. aerial reconnaissance over free world areas including the United States—only we did not put on a propaganda show about it.

The U-2 incident should mobilize world opinion and bring it to bear upon the U.S.S.R. to put it in a mood to agree to pending treaties to protect against surprise attack, to end nuclear testing and for disarmament as consistently proposed by the free world nations. Second thoughts should show that the United States is not embarrassed, but that on the contrary, the free world's defensive alliances including the bases which implement them, are more necessary than ever.

As so often happens in these cases, the first impression is neither lasting nor correct. The Russian people themselves must now take careful account of what their regime means to peace. The cause and intentions of the free peoples are seen to be too deeply built to be shaken or confused by the theatricals out of Moscow.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REASSIGNMENT OF CERTAIN OFFICERS IN THE
MARINE CORPS

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to reassign officers designated for supply duty as officers not restricted in the performance of duty in the Marine Corps (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF SELECTED SUPPLY ACTIVITIES AT SAN BERNARDINO AIR MATERIEL AREA

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of selected supply activities at San Bernardino Air Materiel Area, Department of the Air Force, dated April 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF THE GOVERNMENT'S RIGHTS AND PRACTICES RELATING TO CERTAIN HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL SERVICES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of the Government's rights and practices concerning recovery of the cost of hospital and medical services in negligent third-party cases, dated May 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PROVISION FOR EXCEPTIONS TO RULES OF NAVIGATION IN CERTAIN CASES

A letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for exceptions to the rules of navigation in certain cases (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SECRETARY OF COMMERCE TO UTILIZE CERTAIN FUNDS FOR SPECIAL METEOROLOGICAL SERVICES

A letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to utilize funds received from State and local governments and private organizations and individuals for special meteorological services (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered, granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 502 OF GENERAL BRIDGE ACT OF 1946

A letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 502 of the General Bridge Act of 1946, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT OF THE AMERICAN ACADEMY OF ARTS AND LETTERS

A letter from the Assistant to the President, the American Academy of Arts and Letters, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Academy, for the year 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Finance:

"CONCURRENT RESOLUTION EXPRESSING THE CONCERN OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OVER THE UNFAIR COMPETITIVE SITUATION IN WHICH THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY OF THE STATE FINDS ITSELF AND MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO TAKE IMMEDIATE STEPS TO PROTECT THIS INDUSTRY, WHICH EMPLOYS THOUSANDS OF PERSONS AND IS VITAL TO CONTINUED GROWTH AND PROSPERITY OF THIS STATE AND MANY PARTS OF THE NATION

"Whereas the textile industry of the State of South Carolina and many other States of the Nation finds itself in a highly competitive market with foreign goods priced from 20 to 50 percent under those made in the United States; and

"Whereas the reason for this great differential in price is the cheap labor of foreign countries of a much lower standard of living, which makes possible placing on the markets of the world products the selling price of which is far below even the cost of production in the United States, due to our higher wage scale and standard of living; and

"Whereas the general assembly recognizes that if the flood of cheap foreign goods is not regulated to the extent where our own industry is placed on a basis of fair competition the textile industry will be forced out of business; and

"Whereas the loss of an industry the size and importance of the textile mills will be a great blow to the progress of the State of South Carolina and other States similarly affected: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the general assembly does hereby express its deep concern over the flood of cheap foreign goods being placed on the markets of the United States and memorializes the Congress of the United States to take immediate steps to enact remedial legislation; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress and each U.S. Senator from South Carolina and each Representative from this State in the Congress of the United States."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 35

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress and the President of the United States to safeguard and preserve established State and individual rights to the use of water within the separate States

"Whereas recent decisions of the Federal courts and recent assertions from the U.S. Department of Justice have deprived States and persons of rights which the States and persons previously enjoyed to regulate and control the use of water in the respective States; and

"Whereas the decisions and assertions are further a part of a general pattern developing gradually into Federal supremacy and usurpation over water and if continued will destroy individual and States rights over water and substitute an all-powerful centralized government control: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Mississippi (the Senate concurring therein), That the Congress and the President of the United States and the

Senators and Representatives of Mississippi in the Congress of the United States be respectfully petitioned to take all necessary action to —

"(a) preserve the water rights of the individual and the State and to prevent Federal usurpation of these rights;

"(b) to see that legislation is initiated and supported to reestablish to the individuals and to the States the rights taken from them by the Federal courts and the Justice Department; and

"(c) in every way possible reaffirm, renew, and defend the concepts that water rights are property rights and that those established rights to the use of water by a State or an individual should not be taken away without due process of law and adequate compensation; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable President and the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, the chairman of the U.S. Senate and House Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senators and U.S. Representatives.

"Adopted by the senate April 29, 1960.

"PAUL B. JOHNSON,
"President of the Senate.

"Adopted by the house of representatives March 2, 1960.

"WALTER SILLERS,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives."

A resolution adopted by the California Grape and Tree Fruit League, of San Francisco, Calif., relating to featherbedding practices in transportation operations; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Oswego, N.Y., favoring the enactment of legislation to increase the minimum wage to \$1.25 an hour; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

RESOLUTIONS OF ORGANIZATIONS OF STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a series of resolutions adopted by organizations of the State of New York.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE TRANSPORTATION SECTION OF THE NEW YORK BOARD OF TRADE AND APPROVED BY THE DIRECTORS OF THE NEW YORK BOARD OF TRADE

Whereas the New York Board of Trade's transportation section is vitally interested in the preservation of all transportation systems servicing the Port of New York; and

Whereas the 10-percent tax on passenger transportation in the United States imposes an excessive and unnecessary burden upon all who travel in the pursuit of business vital to the national economy and welfare; and

Whereas this levy, imposed as an emergency wartime measure nearly 20 years ago to discourage nonessential use of an overtaxed transportation system, has long since ceased to serve any part or semblance of its purpose; and

Whereas the similar wartime excise tax on the transportation of goods was repealed in 1958; and

Whereas this unnecessary and inequitable excise tax, by adding to the cost of travel and thereby discouraging use of transportation, poses an immediate and serious threat to common carrier services essential to the health and well-being of the Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the transportation section of the New York Board of Trade does support the railroads, the airlines and the bus

lines in their earnest request for the needful elimination of the 10-percent Federal transportation excise tax immediately and in its entirety, as this is in the public interest and essential to the national economy and places the board on record as favoring that repeal; and

Whereas this immediate and complete repeal is incumbent upon the Congress of the United States; be it further

Resolved, That the position of the transportation section of the New York Board of Trade favoring the repeal of this tax be made known to the Congress, and that the Congress be urgently petitioned to take immediate corrective legislative action.

RESOLUTION OF COMMON COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF OSWEGO TO MEMORIALIZE U.S. CONGRESS TO RAISE FEDERAL MINIMUM WAGE TO \$1.25 AN HOUR

Whereas the original Federal minimum wage law, enacted in 1936, which then provided for a minimum wage of 25 cents an hour, has been amended on three separate occasions to bring it more realistically in line with the rising cost of living and our American concept of Federal minimum wage standards; and

Whereas the present Federal minimum wage of \$1 per hour is less than one-half the national average minimum wage of \$2.21 as set determined by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics; and

Whereas wages and salaries paid at this low level make such workers a charge on the economy of the Nation, in that recipient of substandard wages are able to contribute little as consumers or purchasers of goods and services, or as taxpayers or supporters of the community welfare; made often becoming public charges on the State and private agencies; and

Whereas there are States which avail themselves of the funds and services of the Federal Treasury, and of all other Federal agencies, paid out of the Federal tax receipts collected from citizens and industries of the city of Oswego and New York State, whose employees in most cases enjoy wages in excess of the \$1 minimum; and

Whereas many of the other States and their communities whose working people work for wages below \$1.25 are held up as bait to industry as a reason for emigrating from the State, thus placing Oswego and New York State in double jeopardy; and

Whereas the spirit of fair play, humanity, and minimum standards of decency, require that a legal and realistic floor be put under which workers in American industry shall not be employed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Oswego Common Council go on record that the question of decent Federal minimum wages of \$1.25 or over per hour shall be considered above the bipartisan political issues and in the interest of the Oswego and New York State economy, its wage earners, men and women, so that Oswego and New York State will receive its fair share of industrial expansion; and be it further

Resolved, That the Oswego Common Council memorialize Congress to pass an appropriate amendment to the Federal minimum wage of \$1.25 or higher the law of the land, and also to give appropriate consideration to extending the law to the now exempt workers in American industry and commerce; and be it further

Resolved, That the common council call upon the Honorable Governor, Nelson A. Rockefeller, to use his good office to place this matter before the bipartisan congressional committee, set up by the New York State Members of the U.S. Congress, for the purpose of fostering such legislation, and copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, and Secretary of Labor, and all Members of the U.S. Congress.

RESOLUTION OF JOINT CONFERENCE OF AFFILIATED POSTAL EMPLOYEES OF GREATER NEW YORK AND NORTHERN NEW JERSEY CALLING FOR SALARY INCREASE FOR POSTAL EMPLOYEES

Whereas the average weekly take-home pay for postal employees is only \$74 per week; and

Whereas any number of impartial surveys show that an annual salary of more than \$6,000 is needed today in order to be able to support an American family in a decent manner; and

Whereas the U.S. Department of Commerce, in a recent report, cited the average annual wage in the United States as above \$6,000; and

Whereas the cost of living has been steadily rising to unprecedented heights; and

Whereas the annual salaries of postal employees are so low as to force over 80 percent of all postal employees to work two jobs in order to meet present-day living costs; and

Whereas wives of many postal employees have been compelled to take employment in order to make ends meet and, therefore, have had their family lives disrupted; and

Whereas this has resulted in a steady lowering in the standard of living of postal employees to a point where it is behind that of other civil servants in State and city; and

Whereas postal employees' salaries have, for a long time continued to lag behind the salaries of organized workers in private industry; and

Whereas the U.S. Government has an obligation to accord its employees the fair treatment it requires private industry to render to those it employs: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That this rally of the Joint Conference of Affiliated Postal Employees of Greater New York and Northern New Jersey, which represents 35,000 postal employees of all crafts in the metropolitan area, assembled at the High School of Fashion Industries in New York City on Sunday, May 1, 1960, goes on record seeking the enactment of legislation which will establish an average \$6,000 annual salary for postal employees; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to President Dwight D. Eisenhower, Vice President Richard M. Nixon, Senator Lyndon B. Johnson, Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen; chairman of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, chairman of House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, Speaker Sam Rayburn, Representative Charles Halleck, presidents of the National Postal Unions whose locals are affiliates of the joint conference, President George Meany, AFL-CIO; all metropolitan newspapers, wire services, television and radio stations.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CIVIL AND BUSINESS FEDERATION, WHITE PLAINS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Resolved, That the Civic and Business Federation, White Plains Chamber of Commerce, after due deliberation and consideration of all the facts pertaining to the so-called Forand bill (H.R. 4700) or any substitute thereof, opposes the adoption of Federal legislation for such purposes; and be it further

Resolved, That we are not opposed to the providing of medical care to the aged as we recognize a present need for such care, but our opposition stems from the Federal Government entering into the picture of medical care particularly as part of our social security system. This, we feel, leads us further toward the door of socialized medicine which is contrary to the principles of our American democracy and, while theoretically possible, breaks down under the practical implementation of such a program.

We feel that the immediate need for medical care for the aged, if provided, should be accomplished on an individual voluntary

TAB

THE SHOOTING DOWN OF THE U.S. PLANE OVER RUSSIA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this time I may proceed for 6 minutes in addition to the time permitted under the order entered as to length of statements.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the facts in the plane incident are now becoming clear. They are not pleasant facts, and we shall do well to face them as the President and the Secretary of State are doing. Acknowledgment of the identity of the plane and its general purposes was the only honorable course to pursue in this situation. I commend both the President and Mr. Herter; and I commend the Soviet Premier, too, for his perspicacity in recognizing that the President had no advance knowledge of this action.

These attitudes may help to put the incident in the larger perspective of the critical need of mankind to find a way out of the deadly morass of incipient nuclear war. The attitudes would appear to make possible the convening of the summit conference as scheduled and, I would hope, would permit the President, if he so desired, to go to Russia this summer.

Let it not be assumed, however, that this incident will soon be forgotten and that, after a little while, we can go back to cold war as usual. I hope the Russians no less than ourselves will grasp the larger and lasting significance of this incident. If I may say so, that significance is not to be found in treaties on the immorality of spying. It is not for the Russians to lecture us on that subject. For there is spying and there is spying, and he who is with sin in this matter ought not to cast the first stone.

I shall not take the time of the Senate, nor Mr. Khrushchev's—if these remarks should come to his attention—to review the history of Soviet espionage in this country and throughout the world during the past quarter century. If one wishes to speak of immorality and provocations, there is more than enough to go around. But there is no point in raking recriminations out of the sorry ashes of the past.

That is precisely the point which this incident should bring home to the Russians no less than to ourselves. We are dealing in this incident, as in the many variations of espionage which have already been indulged in by all, not so much with acts of immorality, but with acts of desperation, with unwise, foolish acts, perhaps, but with the inevitable acts of mutual terror, which stem from the fearful situation into which the world has been allowed to drift.

That is the larger significance of this incident. We will make a great contribution to the peace of mankind if we recognize that significance rather than attempt to minimize the incident by proclaiming that the Russians have done worse in the past. Mr. Khrushchev, too, will make a great contribution to the peace of mankind if he concentrates on

the fearful world situation which gave rise to the incident. To do so, however, he will have to forgo the urge to don the robes of the pulpit and deliver sermons on morality. He will have to resist the obvious temptation to milk this incident of the last drop of propaganda value.

That may be asking a great deal, for I cannot say in all honesty that we have done very well on this score in the past. Nevertheless, if the Russians, no less than ourselves, mean to have peace, if we mean to put an end to the fearful situation which gives rise to these incidents, then they, no less than we, must make an end to the childlike, black-and-white, cowboy-and-Indian, gangster-and-policeman interpretation of the world and its peoples and what transpires among them.

For us, for this Nation, there are other reasons—national reasons—why this incident cannot and must not be put aside lightly. There are implications in this incident which go to the very heart of our system of representative, responsible government.

The record will show that I have supported, as firmly as I have been able, the preservation of the primary powers of the Presidency, through Republican and Democratic administrations, in matters pertaining to the conduct of foreign policy and defense. The record is available in the debates on the Formosa resolution, on the Eisenhower resolution, and on other matters. That support, Mr. President, however, was contingent on the assumption that the powers of the Presidency would be exercised by the duly elected, duly constituted President. It is one thing for an elected, popularly responsive President to exercise these enormous powers. It is another for the nonelected, nonresponsive bureaucracy to take upon itself these powers.

The President has made it quite clear that he had no knowledge of the flight of the plane involved in this incident. Yet somewhere in this Government, in some fashion, orders were given, a chain of command was followed. And the net result was to bring about the most serious damage to our efforts to promote peace. The President has been undercut on the eve of a major international conference at a moment of world crisis. The worldwide adverse repercussions to the foreign policy of the United States have only begun, but they will be heard loudly and ominously from Norway to Japan. Moreover, this incident or any other of this kind might well have accidentally set off the holocaust of nuclear conflict which we have been striving at great cost and sacrifice to prevent.

All of these consequences—these damaging consequences—have derived from the exercise of the powers of the Presidency in foreign relations and defense, but the powers have been exercised without the knowledge of the President and, as far as I am aware, without the knowledge of even a member of the Cabinet. These consequences, in short, may well have derived not from an act of responsible representative government, but from what on other occa-

sions I have tried to define as government by agency rivalry or agency accommodation.

It is this problem to which the plane incident compels us to address our attention firmly and relentlessly. The President played no part in the particular incident, but the administration, any administration, nevertheless, does bear a grave responsibility, for it is incumbent on it to provide politically responsible leadership to, and popularly responsible control over, the bureaucracy. Nor is Congress without responsibility. For, while the administration conducts the foreign relations and defense of the Nation, Congress can and does color this conduct in providing for the agencies which serve the President in this connection.

The need, now, as it long has been, is to see to it that the actions of the agencies of this Government reflect the foreign policies which should be laid down by the President through the Secretary of State. The need is to see to it that when the President and the Secretary of State give voice to policies of peace, no agency presumes to undo what they say—by accident or design.

It would not be difficult, I suppose, to find scapegoats for this incident. Nor would it be difficult to make political capital of it. The interests of the Nation and the hope for peace, however, will hardly be served by either course. I hope all of us will eschew either a blood lust for scapegoats or the temptations of political advantage in this incident. I hope the administration and the Congress together will strive to get at the dangerous flaws in the structure of the executive branch of this Government, at the grounds of irresponsibility which give rise to incidents of this kind, and put an end to them before irreparable damage is done to the freedom and safety of the Nation and to the prospects for peace.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I had intended no comment on the incident that was so generously ventilated in the press yesterday. Whatever I have to say, I say entirely on my own responsibility, and I speak for no one other than myself.

It is now a little over 40 years ago that I served in the Army Intelligence Service in Germany. I became familiar with our intelligence operations, and I know what their general object is, and that they proceed in a most realistic fashion.

One reason why the Central Intelligence Agency was created, and why it has been functioning for a good many years, is that we recognize the need for intelligence service in the Army, in the Navy, and in the Air Force; and in maintaining such a service, we assume a realistic posture, and take account of something that is as old as Biblical history. I think there is reference in the Bible to spies who were concealed, of long ago. Those spies, of course, were trying to secure information, which one may well assume was designed for the security of the people whom they represented.

I have read a great deal in this field. Every country is forever trying to im-

plement and to fortify its security by obtaining information, wherever and whenever it can, which will be useful in the cause of security and defense.

I have no comment to make upon this particular incident, but if it fits into that pattern it certainly would not be singularly strange, I would say. I am speaking now as one who served in the Intelligence Service of the Army; namely, G-2. The business of the service was to try to procure information wherever it could and whenever it could, from whatever source it could, to serve the interests of the country.

I am confident that M. Charles de Gaulle, the President of France, is a realist in that field. I am confident that Prime Minister Macmillan of England is an absolute realist in that field. I am certain, having listened to the words of and had an opportunity to ask questions of the Premier of Russia, Mr. Khrushchev, in the Committee on Foreign Relations, that he is an absolute realist.

I will remember as long as I live something of Mr. Khrushchev's irritation when I continued to pursue a line of questioning with respect to censored dispatches from Moscow. He finally turned off that line of questions by saying simply, "How would we know whether these correspondents were not spies?"

We know the Russians take a pretty realistic estimate of who comes to their country, what their business is, and whether they are procuring information which may be useful for security and defensive purposes.

I add that the President of the United States and the military leaders of our country are realists as well. In that concept and in that estimate they have followed a pattern which is as old as the relationships of human beings of different groups and tribes, which go back thousands of years.

Without commenting specifically upon the incident, since I would rather ascertain, if I can, what all the facts are, I think the statement I saw as an official statement yesterday was marked by complete candor and simply took account of the verities which are involved. I am certain that in due course there will be clarification and there will be some amplification, to set it all in proper perspective.

The acting majority leader is very sincerely correct when he says this is no occasion for moralizing upon the morality or immorality of the business of procuring information by means of whatever intelligence services are at the command of the country. Such conduct has been followed for a long time. We have been supplying the funds which are necessary. We do not pry too deeply into the techniques, the methods, and the approaches which are employed, but we are certain that other countries, including the Soviet Union, are doing the same thing, probably to a degree that makes some of our efforts pale perhaps not into particular insignificance, but at least makes them measure up as being much smaller than the amount of money, time, and energy which other nations devote to the work.

The Soviet Union's security network, as everyone knows, is really a very, very tight network. We have had occasion to see how it works. As a member of the McCarthy committee long ago, I remember a good deal of the testimony which was offered at that time, which had a direct bearing upon the efforts going on in this country to secure information which might be useful to the Soviet Union.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. Reference has been made by the minority leader to Mr. Khrushchev as being an absolute realist in this field.

In view of the fact that the provisions of the Litvinov-Roosevelt agreement, entered into in 1933, provided for the abolition of the Comintern, and that the Soviets would refrain from espionage work in this country, could it not be said that there has been constant violation rather than observation of that agreement?

Considering all we know about the present efforts of espionage and subversion in this country, at the hands of the Communist Party of America, and others, would it not also be in order to refer to Mr. Khrushchev as being a practicing realist and a currently practicing realist in this field?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The record is an open book on that point.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, about 8 o'clock last Saturday evening at my home in Lexington I received a call from a reporter of the Roanoke Times asking if I knew that an American plane manned by a Virginia boy had been shot down in Russia. I said I had heard that news at 6 o'clock. The reporter said the Associated Press reported the flight was authorized.

I said, "I cannot believe that is true, for any officer to order a man into Russia is equivalent to signing his death warrant. For any flier to go voluntarily into Russia is to commit suicide."

I had been hearing testimony presented before the Committee on Appropriations by the Central Intelligence Agency for 13 years. Never during that time were we told what the money was to be used for. It was a deep, dark secret. I did not know, and today I asked a number of members of our Defense Subcommittee if they knew that the Central Intelligence Agency owned and operated planes, and they said they did not. Consequently, I was positive it was a military plane, and that no officer would have directed the pilot of a military plane to fly over Russia.

The only satisfaction which I have from the tragic mistake is the one mentioned by the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], that our President and our Secretary of State knew nothing about it and had no responsibility. However, somebody made a tragic blunder. It was not only a tragic blunder of trying to send a plane across the continent of Russia, but in violating the neutrality of two friendly nations, for the morning paper indicates that the flight was to start in Pakistan

and to end in the friendly country of Norway. That was a gap. Someone made a terrible mistake in ordering the flight, and it is the second costly mistake in recent years. I point that out because we had no notice that the Communists of North Korea were poised to attack South Korea, and when we called representatives of the Central Intelligence Agency before us, they said:

We reported to the President, to the Secretary of State, to the Pentagon, and to all the branches of the military service that the North Koreans had assembled close to the border an unusual quantity of heavy artillery and tanks, but it was not our responsibility to evaluate that information.

The attack started and we knew nothing about it. We never got any explanation, when it would have been so easy to have divulged such information. We had no information at all that the attack was coming in North Korea when it did, catching us flatfooted. We almost lost the war before we could get into it and bring the necessary troops to bear for our defense.

As has been pointed out by the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] on the eve of a momentous international peace conference, we have a decision to make which is very embarrassing. As I said, it embarrassed me not to know that the CIA had planes, and I made the statement in all good faith that I was shocked, and I would not believe that anybody had sent a pilot into Russian territory, as alleged, and as has since been admitted by our State Department.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I listened with intense interest and approval to the statement made by the distinguished assistant majority leader, the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and to the statement made by the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], regarding the incident of the young man in our plane which was shot down over the Soviet Union.

Of course, I regret that this plane was shot down and the young man had to parachute to safety within the Soviet Union. It is to be regretted that on the eve of the conference at the summit the dictator of the Soviet Union should gain a propaganda advantage from this incident.

However, I am neither surprised nor shocked by the fact that it is necessary for those who have the defense of this Nation as their responsibility to be compelled to penetrate the Iron Curtain in any manner possible, and thus penetrate the secrecy which surrounds the activities of the Soviet Union within its borders.

We know that the Soviet Union has submarines off our shores. We know that the Russians are engaged in surveillance within the borders of the United States. We know that they have spy rings operating within this country. We know that it is comparatively easy for those in command in the Soviet Union to obtain information on the missile strength, the submarine strength, the jet air strength, and the rocketry of the United States.

1960

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

9079

However, we in the United States are confronted with a different situation. We can obtain that kind of information with reference to the Soviet Union only by agents within the Soviet Union, by intelligence that we are able to gather from the Soviet Union, and perhaps by aerial reconnaissance.

Therefore, the latest incident is not shocking to me. Those constituents of mine in Ohio who have written to me, saying that we should forego the summit conference because of this incident, are completely wrong, in my opinion.

It was with a considerable feeling of pride that I read the candid and truthful statement issued by the Secretary of State, Mr. Herter. Years ago I served in the House of Representatives with him. He was my colleague there. I regard him as a good Secretary of State, in the tradition of Cordell Hull, Dean Acheson, and other great American Secretaries of State.

I take comfort from the fact that in any conference in which the U.S. Government will take part, it will be represented by our determined, honest, and highly patriotic Secretary of State, Mr. Herter. I am sure that he is fully capable of dealing face to face with any leader of the Soviet Union.

Of course, the summit conference should be held. If I were to make a prediction about the fate of the young man who had to parachute to safety inside the Soviet Union, my prediction would be that, instead of being executed, it is just as likely that Mr. Khrushchev will issue a statement on the eve of the summit conference that this young man will be given safe conduct out of the Soviet Union.

The people of America are entitled to know the facts. Our country is great because of the courage, industry, intelligence, and enterprise of the people back home from whom the authority in this country comes, not because of a comparatively few people who are in a position of authority in Washington.

How was it possible for us to ascertain the fact that the Soviet Union now has a missile lead over this Nation, has more intercontinental ballistic missiles in operational status within the Soviet Union, capable of striking targets within this country in perhaps 15 or 20 minutes, except by our intelligence penetrating behind the Iron Curtain? How do we know that at the present time the Soviet Union has a submarine fleet of perhaps 450 or 500 submarines, with perhaps a 3-to-1 supremacy over us—and we must remember that Hitler started aggressive warfare with fewer than 70 submarines—except by the enterprise and courage of men in our Central Intelligence Agency and in our Armed Forces? It is through their reports that we in the Senate secure the facts and are able to bring those facts to the knowledge of the American people.

That is why such activities are needed. Unfortunately, this Nation is engaged in a cold war with the Soviet Union. It is not of our will. It is regrettable that even a few are losing their lives in it. But we should face the facts.

We in America are living in a grim period of international anarchy. Those of our leaders who participate in conferences at the summit with the leaders of the Soviet Union will be much better off if they are fully informed. The only way in which they can be fully informed is by intelligence. It is unfortunate if a plane is shot down, and the dictator of the Soviet Union boasts about a new rocket which scored the hit. We should be comforted by the thought that because of the intelligence we are able to obtain, we may also have rockets and intercontinental ballistic missiles which are fully capable of hitting their targets.

I am sorry to assert that at the moment, largely because of duplication in our Armed Forces, the progress of the United States is behind that of the Soviet Union in rocketry, intercontinental ballistic missiles, and submarine strength. We in Congress must close our ranks in order to close that gap. We must encourage meetings at the summit and conferences with the leaders of the Soviet Union. The more often those conferences take place with our delegation, headed by men of determination, buttressed by information obtained through our intelligence, the greater the likelihood will be that we may eventually have complete disarmament, with adequate safeguards. Then the leaders of the Soviet Union will be compelled to abide by and obey the agreements which they enter into.

So, in this hour, instead of being critical, instead of saying that we are shocked with this matter, let us be realists, as are the distinguished assistant majority leader and the distinguished minority leader. Let us close our ranks and back up with determination our leaders who will participate in the summit conference. We want them to confer with the utmost determination for the welfare and safety of the American people. I am confident that they will do just that.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I wish I might agree with the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young], but I find it difficult to close ranks behind the President in the case of an incident about which the State Department and the administration say he knew nothing.

It seems to me that the decision to fly a plane across the heartland of Russia is one which should have been made at the highest levels of Government in this country. I will not dispute the statement of the administration that the President knew nothing about it. But if he did not—and I hope he did—I say that that fact is a worse indictment than if he had knowledge of it and had approved it.

I introduced early in this Congress a resolution for the establishment of a Joint Commission on Intelligence Information. Similar proposed legislation has been introduced by other Members of Congress in this Congress and in previous Congresses.

In 1953, the Hoover Commission undertook a study of intelligence and information services in the United States and recommended that a joint committee be established, so that Congress might

exercise some kind of continuous surveillance over the intelligence activities of our Government.

It seems to me that the events which have occurred since 1955, when this recommendation was made, underscore the wisdom of that recommendation.

In the case of the Suez crisis, we were told that our Intelligence Service had no advance knowledge, and that we had not anticipated any such action.

Again, in the case of the Hungarian revolt, the indications were that our intelligence had really not anticipated that any such event would occur, even though we were told that the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe were giving what were taken to be assurances of some kind of support from the United States in the event that revolts did occur in the middle European area.

When the Vice President went to South America and was the object of several unpleasant incidents in that country, our Government received conflicting reports. Some said that intelligence had warned against his going; some said that intelligence thought he was going to receive a most pleasant reception.

In general, Russian progress and advancements in the field of science seem to have been unknown to our Intelligence Agency. The administration expressed surprise at the great progress which was being made. With the launching of the Russian sputnik in 1957, our Government became aware that Russia was no longer a country in which science was in its primitive stage.

In general, the intelligence which we have received, or at least that which has been given to Congress and the public with regard to Soviet activities has been inadequate and behind the times.

Now we have been confronted with an incident which has been variously reported and variously explained. A test pilot for Lockheed, we are told, was flying an intelligence mission over the heart of the Soviet Union. I think Congress has the responsibility to ascertain what the facts are in this case.

Is our intelligence now being let out on contract to private enterprise? Is this the explanation we are to accept? I urge the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations to hold hearings on this question. I hope he will hold hearings on the proposition of establishing a Joint Commission on Intelligence and Information. I think this is a responsibility which rests on the entire Congress, Democratic and Republican alike, but one which rests particularly upon the Democratic majority of the Senate and House of Representatives.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. CANNON. I, too, am disturbed about the comment that the aircraft in question was being piloted by a Lockheed test pilot having civilian status. I am also disturbed about the position which NASA may play in this particular picture, as evidenced by one of the newspaper articles.

I am certain the Senator from Minnesota recalls that in 1958 Congress authorized NASA as an independent agency,

and declared that it was the policy of the United States that activity in space should be devoted to peaceful purposes, and authorized NASA in the authorizing legislation toward that end.

It was further declared that such activities should be directed by the Space Agency, and that the Department of Defense would assume all responsibility in connection with the peace and security of our country in connection with military operations.

I ask the distinguished Senator from Minnesota whether, if NASA is actually involved in this matter, it would appear to him that they have far exceeded their constitutional authority as designated by Congress in the Space Act of 1958.

Mr. McCARTHY. They certainly would be in clear violation of the intent of Congress and would prejudice the position of NASA, both in the United States and throughout the rest of the world, as an agency having potentially great influence for peace.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield further?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. CANNON. In one of the newspapers I saw an article in which it was stated that perhaps NASA had loaned the airplane, which presumably it owned, to some other agency, for operation in that area.

I should like to direct the attention of the Senate to section 201(e) (4), of title II of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958. Subsection (e) of section 201 covers the specific duties of the President, and provides, among other things:

In conformity with the provisions of section 102 of this act, it shall be the duty of the President to—

And now I drop down to subsection (4)—

(4) provide for effective cooperation between the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Department of Defense in all such activities, and specify which of such activities may be carried on concurrently by both such agencies notwithstanding the assignment of primary responsibility therefor to one or the other of such agencies.

In view of that provision and also in view of the statement of the Senator from Minnesota that the President disclaims any knowledge of, or responsibility for, this incident, would it appear that if NASA has, in effect, engaged in a cooperative agreement with the Department of Defense, without the knowledge or authority of the President, NASA has thereby exceeded its authority, insofar as this act of Congress is concerned?

Mr. McCARTHY. I certainly must answer the Senator's question in the affirmative, and must say that the President, either himself or through his agents or representatives, has failed to meet the responsibility which the Congress has imposed upon him by means of that act.

But this is not surprising, because the thesis under which this administration seems to operate is one which has developed under the French monarchy, which was that if anything went wrong, the King was not to be blamed, but the fault

was to be placed on one of his advisers. It was said that that led to civil obedience. But it did not lead to good government.

I fear that the same thesis is being followed by the present administration of the Government of the United States.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield further to me?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. CANNON. I should like to ask the Senator whether, in view of these circumstances, it appears that at least this incident was very poorly timed, most ill conceived, and very improperly handled, regardless of who assumes the responsibility or is chargeable with it, at a time when we are trying to negotiate in good faith, in order to derive some benefits and some good out of the forthcoming conference.

Mr. McCARTHY. I certainly agree with the Senator from Nevada. The accuracy of his conclusions and observations is obvious; and I thank the Senator for his contributions.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, as an American, I am most gratified that, with regard to the plane incident, the majority leader of the Senate has made a prompt appeal for national unity, and has said this is a time for all Americans to keep their heads and to dedicate themselves to the unity of the country. I am also very proud of the fact that the majority whip [Mr. MANSFIELD] has assumed—as he always does—a responsible attitude in a time of the occurrence of critical developments in our national life.

I particularly deplore any attempt to make political capital out of a situation which evolves from the fact that it is the duty of the intelligence forces of the United States at all times to protect the security of the United States.

I suggest that this would be a very good time to look at the other side of the coin, and to ask ourselves what kind of furor would arise if our forces were not alert; what sort of reaction would be expected from the country and from the Congress if it were to appear that explosions, the development of new and terrible weapons, or secret activities of a menacing and hostile nature, were taking place on the part of the Soviet Government, and we were unaware of them.

Mr. President, in the Second World War, I was a naval intelligence officer in the Pacific; and I think it is the height of naivete for anyone to contend that espionage is not practiced by all major nations at all times.

Not to admit that we are embarrassed by this event would be a lack of candor. Not to admit that we have violated the 11th commandment—namely, Thou shalt not get caught—would also be a lack of candor.

But, Mr. President, it would be far worse if our country were not alert to detect any activity, anywhere in the world, which menaces the security of the United States.

I suppose it is to be expected that some people, at some times, in some places, will attempt to make political capital of an event of that kind. The responsible leadership of this body has not done so. I would not in the least be surprised to

find someone writing in the press or some other person attempt to link this incident to the West Virginia primary or to some other unrelated event.

But, Mr. President, the plain facts, as I view them, are that we are supporting, and we must support, the intelligence activities of the United States; and that if those intelligence activities have fallen short, we have the right to inquire and to investigate. I raise no objection to having the Congress inform itself fully of the circumstances in connection with this matter.

But there is a great difference between investigating to determine the facts and investigating for political advantage.

I suggest that the Congress, and this body in particular, inasmuch as I speak as a Member of this body, confine itself to a determination of the facts, and that such inquiry be at all times carefully limited to protecting the security of the United States and to protecting the military and civilian methods by which we assure that security, and that at all times we be sure that we strike the proper balance between the proper administration of the program and the necessity for the program itself.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record, in connection with my remarks, an editorial published in the New York Tribune and an editorial published in the Philadelphia Inquirer, both bearing this date.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CANNON in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, May 9, 1960]

OUR PLANE WAS SHOT DOWN

There is no obscuring the fact that the prestige of the United States has received a blow. When the Russians shot down a reconnaissance plane deep in their territory, captured the pilot and his films and discovered his flight plan, Premier Khrushchev exploited the event with great shrewdness to undercut the American stand at the summit.

The special difficulty at this time is that the summit conference is generally expected to deal mostly with intangibles. The chief hope of the world is for some relaxation of tensions springing from the meeting of the heads of government. To achieve that and to avert pressures which the Soviet Union is expected to exert for a change in the status of Berlin and Germany, the West must bring into play all the moral authority it can muster.

In the eyes of very many that moral authority has been impaired at a critical moment. Even those who accept the absolute necessity of maintaining intelligence services to learn as much as possible about the massive military machine poised against the free world by the Soviet Union must question why this particular flight—on the face of it a very dangerous one—was made at this particular time.

Perhaps the answer may never be known to the public. In the nature of things, intelligence activities are secret in virtually all their aspects—if any of the latter become known, it is almost always an error. In this instance, the United States must face up to the consequences of such an error. But the consequences should not be overstated.

In the first place, the downing of the American plane, however costly its diplo-

1960

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

9081

matic and propaganda effects, is no argument whatever against intelligence work in general. The world in which we live makes such work supremely necessary to the security of this Nation and all its allies.

The number of Communist spies who have been caught, the ramifications of their network of espionage, sabotage, and subversion are common knowledge. To meet this by the most efficient possible system of intelligence and counterintelligence is a first responsibility of any free government.

In the second place, however gleeful Mr. Khrushchev and the Soviet press may be over the episode, whatever doubts it may stir among the uninformed, it does not affect in the slightest the basic goals of the United States and the West.

The freedom of 2 million residents of West Berlin is no less important because of the public revelation that the United States has engaged in a form of reconnaissance that both sides have practiced for years. The safeguarding of West Germany is no less significant. The need for controlled disarmament is even more evident.

Finally, while many Americans will be disturbed and unhappy over the equivocal position in which their Government has been placed, there is no disunity here. The American people insist that their guardians be alert. If that involves errors or incidents the price may be high—but not as high as being taken unawares by aggression. Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, in offering his support and that of the Democratic Party to the President in this crisis, put the fundamental American reaction well:

"We do not know just how far Premier Khrushchev intends to push his saber rattling. But we do know just how far Americans intend to go to preserve their freedoms—right to the limit. And by that I mean all Americans—Republicans and Democrats alike."

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, May 9, 1960]

FACING UP TO REALITIES

The State Department has made the best of a bad situation in explaining the mission of the U.S. plane that Premier Khrushchev says was shot down over Russian territory.

Millions of Americans are shocked by the State Department's pronouncement. Some find it hard to believe this country would engage deliberately in activities intended to learn secrets behind the Iron Curtain.

Serious errors of judgment may have been made somewhere in the ranks of U.S. intelligence when the American plane was permitted to fly over the Soviet border so close to the scheduled opening of important East-West summit talks in Paris 1 week from today. The United States and allies find themselves in an extremely embarrassing and disadvantageous position as Mr. Khrushchev gloats over the alleged capture and confession of an American spy.

It would be unfair, however, to condemn whoever was responsible for this flight until all the facts are known. The situation is muddled at the moment. While a serious blunder appears to have been made by someone, it should be borne in mind that a function of intelligence is to safeguard the Nation against surprise attack at all times.

Suspension of U.S. flights near the Russian border during the presummit period would seem on the surface a wise move to avert precisely the kind of crisis which now has arisen. But an important question is whether the plane was sent aloft for some purpose essential to American security.

Suppose, for example, that U.S. intelligence operations along the Iron Curtain had been suspended until after the summit conference in the interests of peace and goodwill. And suppose that Russia took advantage of this lapse in American security to

stage a surprise foray against, say, the Middle East. Under such circumstances the very persons who now loudly condemn U.S. intelligence officers for sending a plane over Russia would protest even louder their failure to be constantly on the alert.

Hardly a week goes by without someone in Congress quoting the latest intelligence estimates of Russian military strength. It has long been obvious that such information is obtained through a system of espionage, whether conducted from the air or on the ground. As the State Department said, "Intelligence collection activities are practiced by all countries and the Soviet Union has not been lagging behind in this field."

Disclosure of the U.S. plane's real mission does not necessarily reflect bad faith on Government spokesmen who previously said the aircraft was on a weather research flight. It is common procedure for intelligence operations to be disguised and many persons in official capacity may have thought the purpose was weather research.

Of immediate urgency is the need for a personal interview with the pilot of the plane by American Embassy officials in Moscow. This might shed new light on the story of the pilot's confession.

Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, we believe, performed a service to the country and gave good advice to the American people in issuing a prompt appeal for national unity. The Democratic majority leader of the Senate did not exaggerate in the slightest when he said "there is no doubt that a serious international crisis may be in the making." This is, as JOHNSON said, a "time for all Americans to keep their heads" and "dedicate themselves to the unity of the country."

It is a time, too, for all Americans to face up to the grim realities of the cold war and not be misled by Khrushchev's self-righteous sneers at the integrity of the United States.

DISARMAMENT AND THE RECENT AIRPLANE INCIDENT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I received in this morning's mail from the University of Wisconsin a resolution in relation to disarmament. This resolution, and bearing in mind the facts which developed yesterday in relation to the United States plane that was shot down over Russia, caused me ask myself a few questions. I remember back in the early 1930's when the Japanese walked out on the League of Nations. I remember that the great talk then was disarmament, and after the First World War we did partially disarm. We dismantled a great deal of our Navy, and the hopes and the prayers of all the people were toward the end that war would be no more.

Then I remember that, after the Japanese walked out at Geneva, they started building up their forces. I remember that Pearl Harbor then came upon us. We were asleep, and thought it could not happen. I remember listening to President Roosevelt give his tremendous challenge, and we declared war.

Another question that came to my mind was: What was the effect of the shooting down of our plane? Would it affect the summit conference? In my humble opinion, the answer is, "No." We have been playing poker too long. Khrushchev is one of the great international poker players on the world stage. He came over to this country. We took him in. He went back. A few months ago we thought everything was going to be as sweet as honey, and then

he started in with his abuse. The result was that we received letters from people telling us that the thing to do is disarm.

Mr. President, in my humble opinion, every man who will sit down at the council table and everyone who will be associated with the negotiations will be men who know history. The plane incident undoubtedly has had a great effect upon the people in America, whose eyes were again closing, as they were before Pearl Harbor.

I am satisfied that all the bluster of Khrushchev is some more of his poker-playing attitude. He knows that for a long time we have had our airplanes along the boundary line.

As was stated on the floor today, Khrushchev's agents are right in the United States. They are in South America. They are in every capital of South America. They are in the espionage game 24 hours a day. If we read some of the comments in the European papers, we would think the common people of Europe have their eyes closed to the realities of life. Why do we have our Army over there? Why do we have our bases in Turkey, Greece, and elsewhere? Why do we have our airplanes there? It must be that we feel it is necessary to establish a deterrent. It must be, as a Senator said on the floor a little while ago, that it is necessary for us to know what is going on behind the so-called Iron Curtain. Khrushchev knows what is going on on the other side of the Iron Curtain in every nation in Europe—in fact, in every nation in the world. Consequently, when people talk about this incident having a bad effect upon the summit conference, I cannot agree. In my humble opinion, it means there are going to be realists there; and the greatest realist of all will be Khrushchev himself.

The President, after Camp David, of which Khrushchev talked so much, and after the experience of the last several months with Khrushchev, is certainly alert.

One other word, Mr. President. Some persons want to place responsibility for this incident somewhere. I ask them again, Why do we have airplanes in Europe? Why are we training some of our young men in the intelligence field? Of course, we are not supposed to invade another country, but we are living in a time when it is important for us to know what is going on behind that Iron Curtain. As was stated, we have had reconnaissance planes for a long time. What about Russia? Does Russia have some? Yes. Do those airplanes cross the boundary lines? Well, we have not shot any of them down, but they do not have to fly across the boundary lines to get the information they want, because they have their people in every nation of the world.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to remind the Senator from Wisconsin that the Senate is operating under the 3-minute limitation. Does the Senator wish to ask for more time?

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the able

Senator from Wisconsin may proceed for another 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Wisconsin may proceed.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, if the Senator from Wisconsin will yield, I have no desire to urge him not to complete his speech, but how much longer does he wish to take? I have something to present for the morning hour.

Mr. WILEY. I shall finish in about 60 seconds.

Mr. CLARK. Please take more than that.

Mr. WILEY. Such courtesy by the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Pennsylvania is really beyond the stage at which I can thank the Senators for their complimentary attitude, but I do wish to express my gratitude.

I was reasoning out loud, Mr. President, about the effect of the news of the shooting down of our plane. I think more than ever it will mean we will be alert. The American people will be alert. The Armed Forces will be alert.

It may have an effect on the coming conference, that those who are engineering the deal will become more realistic and will realize that some kind of a solution must be found which will bring about a partial disarmament—not a partial disarmament of alertness but a partial disarmament in the weapons of war.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks the resolution of the University of Wisconsin be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN, MILWAUKEE

To the Honorable Christian A. Herter, Editors of the Milwaukee Journal and Sentinel, the Governor of Wisconsin, the Senators and Representatives of Wisconsin in the Congress of the United States:

The current disarmament negotiations at Geneva and the impending summit talks impel us, members of the faculty of the University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, to recommend to your attention the following statement, originally prepared and endorsed by 105 members of the faculty of Johns Hopkins University and Goucher College. This statement represents our personal views:

"Never have the peoples of the world spent so much on armament in time of peace and never have they been so insecure. During the past year the arms competition between the United States and the Soviet Union has become more intense than ever. The continuing spread of nuclear weapons to an enlarging circle of nations increases the danger of war and makes disarmament ever more difficult. The survival of civilization requires the control of armaments of unlimited power and their eventual elimination as instruments of national policy.

"The Soviets in disarmament negotiations have shown suspicion of American proposals for inspection and control, and our own representatives have been reluctant to consider any scheme that would not eliminate every risk of deception. But every alternative open to the United States involves risk. Insistence upon a perfect system only insures that there will be no inspection and no control; the result must be an unrestricted arms race which sooner or later will almost certainly bring about unrestricted nuclear war. The present impasse must be broken.

"Serious as are the conflicting interests between the United States and the U.S.S.R., both countries, we believe, have been too preoccupied with their differences and not enough concerned with their common goals. Americans need not shed all their skepticism about Soviet words and actions; successful international agreements are based more on mutual advantage than on trust. Although the prevailing attitude of distrust has made agreement difficult, the American and Soviet positions on a test ban are now very close as a result of mutual concessions. Any resolution of the remaining differences is preferable to the dangers which would follow a breakdown of negotiations.

"The United States and the Soviet Union have a strong common interest in preventing the spread of nuclear weapons, which appears inevitable without an agreement to stop testing. Recent administration suggestions that such weapons be furnished to American allies would, if carried out, jeopardize further negotiations to end the arms race.

"We believe that the test ban is an essential first step toward comprehensive arms control. In view of the gravity of the present situation we are convinced that the United States should, if necessary, accept considerable risks to achieve the goal of general disarmament in order to avoid the far greater risks attendant upon continuing the arms race."

Arthur P. Becker, Professor of Economics; Neal Billings, Professor of Elementary Education; Mrs. Lois Griggs, Professor of Elementary Education; Lee Lawrence, Professor of History; James March, Professor of Commerce; L. H. Matthews, Professor and Director of Financial Aids; H. O. Engelmann, Associate Professor of Sociology and Anthropology; Gerald Gleason, Associate Professor of Elementary Education; J. A. Leer, Associate Professor of Commerce; John L. Phelan, Associate Professor of History; I. D. Rinder, Associate Professor of Sociology and Anthropology; C. G. Screven, Associate Professor of Psychology; Donald R. Shea, Associate Professor of Political Science; Mrs. Freida Voigt, Associate Professor of German; T. W. Walton, Associate Professor of Elementary Education; Manuel Gottlieb, Visiting Associate Professor of Economics; Harold Altman, Assistant Professor of Art; Martin L. Cohnstaedt, Assistant Professor of Sociology and Anthropology; Bernard Knieger, Assistant Professor of English; Ted Kraynik, Assistant Professor of Art; Eric Schenker, Assistant Professor of Economics; Harold Altman, Assistant Professor of Sociology and Anthropology; Marvin Summers, Assistant Professor of Political Science; J. Dale Chastain, Instructor of Political Science; Justin Replogle, Instructor of English; Peter Sinclair, Instructor of Art; Mrs. C. Shannon, A. Clarke Hogensuck.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I know all of us were tremendously shocked to read in the paper and to hear over the radio the account of the shooting down of an American plane over the Soviet Union. The one thing that we must derive from this incident is that the cold war is still going on. We must remember that Communist dogma, doctrine, and philosophy is pledged to the destruction of all that we in the free world hold dear. We must remember that the Soviet Union is continuing to seek ways and means of subverting us and taking us over, destroying our system in whatever way may pre-

sent itself to them. They obviously know a great deal about us. They have not only an efficient espionage system, but we in this democracy and free world continue to reveal facts and figures about almost everything which we have anyway. They do know a lot about us. Those in our Government whose responsibility it is to protect and defend us against what might be at any moment an onslaught from the Soviet Union have a responsibility to try to find out everything that is possible to find out about the capability of the Soviet Union. If they did not do so, those who are charged with the responsibility, which I presume are the CIA and, in some measure, the Defense Department, I believe would be dilatory in their responsibility to provide protection to the people of the United States. The unfortunate fact about this particular episode is that this particular plane was shot down, and the world is now reminded that we live in a cold and difficult world, that things have not eased off a great deal despite the fact that we have a lot of soft conversation and soft and appeasing words from time to time from the leaders of the Soviet Union. But ideology hardness still exists. They have pledged and dedicated their resources to the destruction of democracy, and particularly to the destruction of the system under which we live. It is unfortunate that events have turned out the way they have, but I believe the lesson we must remind ourselves always to keep in mind is that while from time to time the cold war gets a little colder and then moves into a hot stage—fortunately, not a shooting stage—nonetheless the hard, ideological fact still exists that the Communists are seeking ways to get advantage of us, and in our own interest, to protect ourselves from them, we must continue in every way we can to learn what are their intentions, and specifically what are their capabilities.

I hope this particular episode will not necessarily put us on the defensive when the President of the United States and the Secretary of State go to the summit conference. I do not think it need put us on the defensive. I believe this is a fact of life which almost everybody realized was going on. Almost everyone realized that we are trying to gather information about the Soviet Union wherever and whenever we can. That we are doing so is now before the public. We would be ashamed of ourselves if we were not pursuing this course. We would be derelict in our duty if we were not attempting to learn everything that we could about them. Now that it is out, I do not think there is any great cause for us to go on the defensive. It is unfortunate the information has been revealed in the manner in which it was. Nevertheless I think the long and established record demonstrates that our whole purpose and intention is defensive in nature. We have not over the course of 20 years sought to be aggressive against any country. We have not sought to take over any country, either through military aggression or subversion, and when we seek information it is only in the nature of acquiring exact

1960

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

9083

information so that we may defend ourselves and so that we may defend other nations who are incapable of defending themselves and whom we list in the free world bloc. I believe we have the duty to learn everything we can about them. Therefore I hope and expect that this incident should not put us on the defensive, and I hope the people of this Nation will not think it has.

I hope the people of this Nation will not think it has put us into a difficult situation with respect to the forthcoming developments at the summit conference.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I wish to be associated with the position taken by the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. I would like to add that if the Russians were half as tolerant and free in letting American citizens travel over Russia as we are toward Russian citizens traveling over the United States, events like this would not occur. Only about a year or two ago an aerial picture of the Washington area was published in a Washington newspaper. I suppose every Russian could get an aerial picture of every city in the United States without having to fly military planes over the United States. They have access to all this information, and yet we are denied any information as far as Russia is concerned.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I completely agree with the able Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. We give information to the Russians which they, of course, do not give to us, and yet we in our own interest have to find out what we can about what they are doing, and if our people did not do so, they would be derelict in their duty and exposing us to an unnecessary danger.

Undoubtedly the plan did not work as undoubtedly somebody had planned it would work. I suppose it was planned so that the men would not be detected. However, I do not believe there is any justification for us suddenly to throw up our hands in holy horror and say, "This should not go on."

In this practical world in which Soviet Russia is pledged to destroy us and are building capabilities to destroy us we have to know what they are doing, and I am sure the Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles of the CIA, and the President will move on in their efforts to demonstrate, probably from this particular incident, that it would be better all around if we could have inspection as we have asked for of what is going on in their country, so that we can on that inspection bring about a disarmament proposal by which we would disarm and they would disarm, so that this kind of action would not be necessary. It lends emphasis to the thought that we should pursue a meaningful and useful disarmament program coupled with a proper inspection program so that we can lessen attention and do away with this kind of espionage system on their part as well as on ours.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I have not discussed this matter with any other

member of the Foreign Relations Committee; therefore, what I shall say at this time represents my own thinking.

As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I feel some responsibility in connection with international developments; and I strongly urge that the administration suggest to the Secretary of State, to the head of the CIA, Mr. Alan Dulles, and to others, that they tell us what happened in Russia, particularly in the case of the plane that was shot down.

I understand they have limited the explanation, at least at this time, in particular, to the leadership of the Senate and to the chairmen and the ranking minority members of the Foreign Relations Committee and the Armed Services Committee.

As one member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I wish to protest against this situation—not against the giving of the information to them, but against the fact that the information is not being given to every member of the Foreign Relations Committee.

This Russian matter is very serious, very embarrassing, and very humiliating. If members of the Foreign Relations Committee are to accept their responsibility in connection with service on that committee, it seems to me they are entitled to have the facts, and to have them today, not tomorrow.

So I want the other members of the Foreign Relations Committee to know how I feel, and I want the Senate to know how I feel, and I want the administration to know how I feel.

I believe the time has come for us to tighten our belts and tighten up our activities and our actions and our thoughts, and to clarify our policies, and to know in what direction the country is going and what is occurring, and not constantly be put in the position of being embarrassed and humiliated and having to deal without knowledge of the full and complete facts in connection with incidents which develop from time to time, and which prove embarrassing to me, both as a citizen and as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the execution of one's duties as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee depends completely upon the accuracy of the information and the knowledge he has concerning the problems which are to be solved. If knowledge of what is happening is not in the possession of a member of the committee, his ultimate judgment can be rooted only in guesses, and never in facts. If it happens that his judgment is rooted in facts, it comes only as an accident. That would be a most dangerous method of trying to execute his duty.

I would like to know the basic facts surrounding the incident that occurred in the Soviet. It does not necessarily follow that I at this time condone or do not condone what has happened. I will not believe that at this moment there are not in the United States many representatives of Communist Russia and other Communist nations that are gathering information about what we are doing.

In our system of government the ability to get information is simpler for the Soviet to get than it is for our Government to get it from the Soviet. Hence, the Soviet, though it is complaining, should remember that in its methods of operation it undoubtedly has, within the boundaries of our country, persons who are spying and trying to get possession of information that will serve the cause of Russia. That fact, however, does not mean that I at this time condone what has happened. I would like to know. We have a Central Intelligence Agency. We rely upon it for information given to the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committees and the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator from Ohio will agree with me that as members of the Foreign Relations Committee, as he and I are, we ought to have the facts; will he not?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have already said that.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator has stated it. I wanted to emphasize that fact. That was the purpose of my saying what I just said. We do not get the facts.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I concur in what the Senator has said.

Mr. CAPEHART. We cannot pass judgment upon these facts. Why they would ignore every member of the Foreign Relations Committee except two is something I shall never understand. Are we second-class members of the committee, or second-class citizens? My people of Indiana want me to have the facts as best I can ascertain them as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee. I am sure that is true of the able Senator from Ohio. We do not get the facts. I am not criticizing anybody for what happened over there, because I do not know the facts. I am just pleading to get the facts, and I know that is what the able Senator from Ohio wishes to have.

Mr. LAUSCHE. At this morning's meeting of the Foreign Relations Committee, I suggested to the chairman that Secretary of State Herter and Mr. Dulles should appear before our committee. I made that suggestion on the basis of wanting to learn the background and the circumstances of the incident in the Soviet. About 5 or 10 minutes ago, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] told me that Mr. Dulles, of the Central Intelligence Agency, and Secretary of State Herter were in a meeting room downstairs, to be attended by the members of the Foreign Relations Committee and one other committee. I went to that room and gained admittance only to be told it was a closed meeting for the leaders of the Senate and the leaders of the House and two members of certain committees. I do not know which committees they were. To my embarrassment, I had to leave. A newspaperman asked me why I was leaving, and, facetiously, I said I was thrown out.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is my position. I would like to know who was responsible for limiting the meeting to just a few. If I remember correctly, it is the entire committee that passes upon matters before the Foreign Relations Committee, as well as the Armed Services Committee. Why should those attending the meeting be limited to just a few? It makes one sort of suspicious as to what the purpose of it is.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I do not know that it makes me suspicious at all—

Mr. CAPEHART. Perhaps that was not a good word.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But I do agree with the Senator from Indiana that, as a Senator burdened with certain responsibilities, and required to answer questions of the citizens of my State, I ought to know in the fullest degree possible what happened.

Mr. CAPEHART. In my opinion, there are too many mistakes being made. As the Senator well knows, I was publicly opposed to the Khrushchev-Eisenhower-Nixon visits back and forth, and I think history is proving I was right.

I do not know about Ohio, but I just came back from Indiana, and our people are very much concerned about this matter. It is a serious matter. They are beginning to wonder if we in Washington know what is going on in the world. It is about time that the administration, which must accept the responsibility for this sort of thing, took the Senate and the House of Representatives into their confidence. Perhaps we could be of some help to them. God knows, they need it, if I can read the record and the times correctly.

Mr. LAUSCHE. With respect to giving us information about how much money we should spend for national defense and for mutual aid, we have had the Central Intelligence Agency representatives testify before our committee. When those representatives came before the committee, I assumed they implied they were getting information about the Soviet. That fact would lead to the question, How are they getting the information? Is it being gotten through voluntary revelation by the Soviet of what it is doing? The answer to that question manifestly would be in the negative. The next question is, "If you are giving us information, how should we assume you got it?"

I would like to know, in discussions that would be had in an adequate meeting. I am disappointed in the fact that we have not been given the right to attend the meeting. However, I do not want to conclude that that right will not be made available to us. The justice of the position taken by the Senator from Indiana to me would indicate that it is indispensable that the members of the Foreign Relations Committee hear what has happened.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes; I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. There is not any question about it. We ought not to be on the committee unless we are entitled to all the facts; and it is within the next

24, 48, or 72 hours that decisions ought to be made on what to say and how to handle this matter. A summit conference is coming up a week from today, and yet we find now that we do not have the facts. We cannot attend the meeting. I do not want to say anything more about it, because I do not want to do anything that is in any way going to give any satisfaction to Mr. Khrushchev; but I believe I know that the people of this Nation want to know what has happened, and they are entitled to know what has happened, because we are being pushed around all over the world, even by a little fellow named "Castro," down in Cuba.

How long will this go on? The people are beginning to wonder, and I think rightly so. One of the reasons I think they wonder is that we in the Senate, who serve on committees responsible for these things, do not have the facts.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I want to separate the two propositions. First, is our right to know what is going on, our right to hear the testimony of the persons who allegedly know. Second, is the question, What should be our realistic course?

When we approach the second question, of course, in a measure we have to be influenced by our knowledge of what the Soviet Union is doing. Is the Soviet Union keeping people in our country—perhaps even sitting in the galleries of the Senate—to learn what is going on? That is the second question.

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not think there is any question that the Soviets do have spies in our country. We have spies in their country.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. CAPEHART. Why have we had so much misinformation in connection with the matter? The first day it was one thing, the second day it was another thing, the third day another thing, and the fourth day another thing. There are a lot of questions which ought to be answered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. My hope and expectation is that shortly the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations will be accorded the right, to which they are entitled, to hear a narration of what actually happened.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, that was the purpose of my rising, to make the remarks I did.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Indiana and I are not engaged in a hostile exchange of views.

Mr. CAPEHART. No. The Senator from Ohio and I are 100 percent together on this matter. We think alike, and have been talking alike. We are 100 percent together. I know exactly how the able Senator feels, because I feel the same way.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I will say to the able Senator from Ohio, I am sorry if I brought the Senator information which later proved not to be exactly correct. I simply presented information which a newsman in a crowded corridor, waiting for the "cloak and dagger" arrival of the head of the CIA and of the Secretary

of State, told me. I was trying to be helpful and friendly to my distinguished friend from Ohio.

I think we could all blow this matter way up out of proportion, if I may say so. It seems to me my distinguished friends on the Committee on Foreign Relations, disappointed as they are in not being included, have probably no greater cause for disappointment than the members of the Committee on Appropriations, of whom I happen to be one, or the members of the Committee on Armed Services, or perhaps members of other committees we could mention.

Since the House of Representatives is also represented at this meeting in this small cloistered chamber in the catacombs of the Capitol, I assume that we will all learn in due time something about the matter.

In the meantime, we are in good company, because the first announcement was that the President did not know anything about it. I think there is nothing for us to feel left out about. I must say again, it is not unusual that this great free country shows itself not to be very adept at "cloak and dagger" tactics.

I must say also, I think we are very adept at the poorest timing which could possibly be practiced. It seems to me anybody engaged in practical politics, as well as anybody engaged in military life, must know that timing is all important. Somebody has committed a mistake, but I do not think we should be too disturbed about it.

I remember that now a colonel of the Russian establishment is languishing in jail because he was spying upon us in our country. I remember other incidents which I will not attempt to recount at the present time.

I think all of us must recall that we have a tremendous stake in this summit conference. No one has quite the stake in it which the President himself has. Much as we might be inclined to voice our disappointment, that we did not know about this, and our regret that we are not learning all about it at once, the best thing we can do, I think, is to suffer in silence until we are told.

In the meantime, we should let the whole world know that the Senate, the Congress, and the country stand behind the effort to attain some degree of peace, and that by all means, regardless of party, we stand behind the efforts of the President. I am sure every Senator on the floor agrees completely with that point of view.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I have no quarrel with what the Senator has said. I simply say that perhaps as a result of our colloquy today we can help in the situation a little bit, to make certain that these things do not happen in the future. Perhaps we can be of some help to the administration, if it will give us the opportunity, if it will give us the facts and the information. That is my position. I said, and I repeat, we have been making too many mistakes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

TAB

point he expresses. He never pulls punches, and he always exercises a good influence on Congress. I am happy that he has been privileged to serve a great State in a great body. The people of America have benefited from that service. Therefore I join in wishing him a happy birthday, and express the hope that he will enjoy many more.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the majority leader. New York State can be justly proud of these two men when they rate the kind of tribute which has just been paid them by the distinguished majority leader.

RUSSIAN ESPIONAGE IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, there is a great uproar around the world at the discovery that the Armed Forces defending the free world against the onslaught of Communist tyranny employ espionage as part of this defense.

The Red dictator, Nikita S. Khrushchev, expresses a great moral distress at this discovery. Some of our allies profess to be dismayed that we use intelligence agents to gather intelligence regarding the plans of an enemy who has brayed out that he intends to "bury us."

It is not for me at this time to dwell on what is presently occurring in this area, but I should like to explore what the headwaters of this problem really are, and to relate some of the disclosures and reports of the Internal Security Subcommittee which have been recorded through the years, and which are well documented.

Where are the headwaters of this problem, Mr. President? The answer to that question has been overflowing into the record all over the world for the past 43 years. Let me give a few summaries from that record.

I quote first from the Second Report of the Subcommittee on Internal Security of March 22, 1954, on "Activities of U.S. Citizens Employed by the United Nations":

On December 13, 1917, Lenin's handful of Bolsheviks, who had just seized the government of Russia, appropriated 2 million rubles for the needs of the revolutionary internationalist movement. Here is the language of the official ordinance as published in the Gazette of the Temporary Workers and Peasants Government, December 13, 1917, and furnished to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee by Secretary of State Charles Evans Hughes:

"The Soviet of Peoples Commissars considers it necessary to come forth with all aid, including financial aid, to the assistance of the left, international wing of the workers movement of all countries, entirely regardless whether those countries are at war with Russia, or in an alliance, or whether they retain their neutrality."

This was the original declaration of revolution against the civilized governments of the world. It was an official statement. It was implemented also by Moscow-inspired revolutionary activity on every continent of the globe.

In 1920, Woodrow Wilson's Secretary of State, Bainbridge Colby, looked at the plain facts of Communist activity, which were visible everywhere then, as they are now, and arrived at this conclusion:

"The existing regime in Russia is based upon the negation of every principle of

honor and good faith. * * * The responsible leaders of the regime have frequently and openly boasted that they are willing to sign agreements and undertakings with foreign powers while not having the slightest intention of observing such undertakings or carrying out such agreements.

"They have made it quite plain that they intend to use every means, including, of course, diplomatic agencies, to promote such revolutionary movements in other countries.

"Inevitably, therefore, the diplomatic service of the Bolshevik Government would become a channel for intrigues and the propaganda of revolt against the institutions and laws of countries, with which it was at peace."

In 1921, the British Government granted de facto recognition to the Soviet Government by means of a trade agreement. The agreement provided for the prohibition of Bolshevik propaganda in Great Britain. Only 2 short years later, Britain threatened to terminate that agreement because Soviet agents were spreading anti-British propaganda in Afghanistan, Persia, and India.

In 1924, regardless of what had already happened, Britain granted the U.S.S.R. de jure recognition. Three years later it terminated both the trade agreement and recognition because the Soviet diplomatic service in Great Britain was acting as a "channel for intrigues and the propaganda of revolt," precisely as our American Secretary of State had predicted 7 years before ("Trends in Russian Foreign Policy", pp. 5, 7, 8, 10).

In 1924, China and the U.S.S.R. established "normal" diplomatic relations. Under the treaty each country was to refrain from spreading propaganda against the institutions of the other. Three years later China broke off relations because the Soviet diplomatic service, once more was acting as a channel for intrigues and the propaganda of revolt (ibid., pp. 8, 10, 11).

In 1924, Mexico recognized the U.S.S.R. In 1930, Mexico withdrew that recognition (ibid., pp. 9, 11).

In 1926 Uruguay recognized the U.S.S.R. In 1935, Uruguay withdrew that recognition, charging Communist activity in Uruguay and elsewhere in South America (ibid., pp. 9, 15).

Despite this record of Soviet perfidy, the United States extended diplomatic recognition to the Soviet Government in 1933 after an exchange of letters between President Roosevelt and Maxim Litvinov, Soviet Foreign Minister, in which Litvinov pledged that the Soviet Union would:

- (1) respect the United States and refrain from interference in the internal affairs of the United States or its territories or possessions,
- (2) refrain from any propaganda, or acts to disturb the tranquility, prosperity, order or security of the United States,
- (3) prevent the formation of any group on Soviet soil, which has the aim of overthrowing the political or social order of the whole or any part of the United States.

This was the first agreement the Soviet Union ever signed with the United States. It was violating the agreement at the very moment that Litvinov was putting his signature to it, it has never ceased to violate this agreement, and it is still violating this agreement today, 27 years after it was signed.

Now I will continue with excerpts from the Internal Security Subcommittee document on "Soviet Political Agreements and Results."

In 1945 the Soviet Government was still our ally, in the war to establish the prin-

ciples of the Atlantic Charter. In September of that year, Igor Gousenko, a Soviet diplomat, went to the Canadian Government with documents which caused an immediate investigation by a specially appointed Canadian Royal Commission. When that investigation was concluded, the Royal Commission found:

"There exists in Canada a fifth column organized and directed by Russian agents in Canada and in Russia" (the report of the Royal Commission, p. 685).

"Members of the staff of the Russian Embassy at Ottawa were actively engaged in inadmissible espionage activities" (ibid., p. 686).

The Royal Commission also stated:

"So far as the evidence discloses, the first head of the Military Intelligence espionage system in Canada after the arrival of the Soviet Minister was Sergei N. Koudriavtzev, whose official title was First Secretary of the Legation [later Embassy]" (ibid., p. 15).

"Major Sokolov, on his arrival in Ottawa in 1942, began to reform the previous organization, and was directed by Molier, who has been identified as one Mikhailiev, an official of the Soviet Consulate in New York who came to Canada for that purpose" (ibid., p. 15).

On October 28, 1953, Ismail Ege, former chief of the Fourth Section of Soviet Military Intelligence, appeared before the subcommittee. He testified that the General Staff Intelligence Department of the Soviet Union used international bodies to conduct espionage. He proved his point by showing that Sergei Koudriavtzev, who had been head of the Red spy apparatus in Canada, later joined the Soviet delegation to the United Nations.

Let us also remember, Mr. President, that Judith Coplon's espionage partner, Valentin Gubitchev, was attached to the Soviet delegation to the United Nations. He was caught redhanded, in company with Coplon herself, and found guilty, but the U.S. Government returned him to the Soviet Union instead of sending him to prison.

On May 12, 1949, Kirill Mikhailovich Alexesv, who had been attached to the Soviet Embassy in Mexico, told the subcommittee that "all responsible workers of a Soviet Embassy are members of the secret intelligence service of the Soviet Government."

In 1951 the Special Committee on Un-Filipino Activities of the Philippine Government found that "the Communist Party is the vanguard of the Soviet Union here; its border patrol on Filipino shores."

In 1955, an Australian Royal Commission found that there had been operating out of the Soviet Embassy in Canberra, a Soviet spy apparatus of the same kind that was discovered in Canada. Vladimir Petrov, the defector from the embassy who uncovered this apparatus, made a memorable statement about his country's espionage activities. Here is what he said—as quoted in the Internal Security Subcommittee Annual Report for 1957:

Espionage is a distinct and principal Soviet industry. This must be so; because the Soviet Union, alone of all the great powers, regards itself as being in a continuous and chronic state of covert warfare with the whole world outside the borders of the Communist empire. And conspiratorial techniques are natural to a regime that seized

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"PROCLAMATION OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER, ALBANY

"On May 10, 1877, the people of Rumania proclaimed their independence of the Ottoman Empire, and confirmed their freedom on the field of battle. The accomplished fact was ratified by the Congress of Berlin in 1878, recognized by the powers of Europe and eventually also by our own Government. "Four years later, also on May 10, Charles I was crowned King of Rumania.

"Americans of Rumanian descent understandably have a warm feeling for that day, and revere it both as commemoration of the past and as a symbol for the future: Now, therefore

"I, Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim May 10, 1960, as 'Rumanian Independence Day' in New York State, and I urge cooperation in its observance."

Given under my hand and the privy seal of the State at the capitol in the city of Albany this 28th day of April in the year of our Lord 1960.

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER.

By the Governor:

WILLIAM J. RONAN,
Secretary to the Governor.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, today, May 10, is celebrated as Rumanian Independence Day.

More than 17 million Rumanians constitute one of the largest nationality groups in the Balkans. These splendid and courageous people have had the misfortune to suffer under oppressive alien regimes during most of modern times. In point of fact, they were obliged to struggle hard and fight continuously in defense of their freedom throughout their long history.

Late in the 15th century Rumania was overrun and conquered by the Ottoman Turks, and for centuries Rumanians lived under the rule of cruel Ottoman sultans. For several centuries they endured the almost unbearable yoke of these alien rulers, but they succeeded in maintaining their traditional national beliefs and ideals. In the middle of the last century they had their chance to attain their goal of independence, and after the conclusion of the Crimean War in 1856 they regained a considerable measure of autonomy under the guarantee of the great powers of Europe. Years later, during the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-78, they again saw their chance and seized upon the occasion by declaring their independence on May 10, 1877. This bold initiative culminated in the founding of the Rumanian kingdom in 1881.

We all are familiar with the present fate of the courageous people of Rumania. Locked behind the Iron Curtain of Communist tyranny, they stand deprived of the great gift of freedom which had been won with their blood and sacrifice. On this, the day of commemoration in the sacred history of their liberty, let us pledge never to forget the plight of the Rumanian people so long as the gates of oppression are closed upon them. Indeed, let us renew our pledge and our efforts to work for the ultimate deliverance which they yearn for and which they so richly deserve.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a brief statement which I have prepared on the Rumanian Independence Day, which is being commemorated today, May 10.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BEALL

On May 10, 1881, King Carol was crowned King of United Rumania, and since that time May 10 has been observed as the day of the founding of the Rumanian kingdom, or Rumanian Independence Day.

After the conclusion of the Crimean War, the Rumanian people regained their autonomy with the guarantee of sovereignty by the great powers of Europe. But the independence of the nation was comparatively short lived; Rumania came under the Communists, and today 17 million Rumanians live in their homeland under Communist totalitarian rule. This day is observed by Rumanians throughout the world, and especially by Rumanians living in America, but it is not observed in Rumania itself. The Communist rulers of that country have forbidden any public observance of this historic date which is so important in the hearts of Rumanians. This is part of the Communist plan to extinguish freedom.

However, the Communist rule cannot extinguish the observance of this day in the hearts and minds of the Rumanian people. Despite Communist repression, the Rumanian people's resolute courage and steadfast faith in freedom continues unbroken.

Our Nation is proud of the many persons of Rumanian descent among its population. They have contributed substantially to our culture and industry, and are among our most responsible citizens.

Let us here in the Senate—and all Americans—renew the historic bonds of friendship with the liberty-loving Rumanian people, and pray that the day will soon come when the people of that nation may again live in freedom and independence.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the American people have never forgotten the countries which lie behind the Iron Curtain. Their tragic slavery under Communist domination stirs the moral conscience of all Americans. Today, marks the independence day of once free Rumania.

Mr. President, it gives me great pleasure to join with all Americans of Rumanian descent and the Rumanians now behind the Iron Curtain in observing the anniversary of Rumanian independence which was won on May 10, 1877.

Today, the proud people of this tragic land live under the crushing burden of Soviet rule. The Red tyranny is oppressive and cruel, but we know the spirit of freedom and national pride still glows in the hearts of its citizenry. Continued passive resistance to Communist objectives is acknowledged even by the oppressors.

On this occasion, we pay tribute to the courage and sturdiness of Rumanian patriots who stand steadfast for independence, and although they cannot openly commemorate this anniversary, we know their hearts are filled with devotion and love for their past liberties.

Let us assume the Rumanian people that they are not forgotten and that our prayer is the hope that not in the too far distant future, Rumanians will again

be privileged to openly observe their day of independence and will be free from Communist domination.

BIRTHDAYS OF REPRESENTATIVES EMANUEL CELLER AND JOHN TABER OF NEW YORK

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to join with others of my colleagues in commemorating the birthdays of EMANUEL CELLER, of New York, and JOHN TABER, of New York, respectively, our senior Democrat and Republican in the New York State congressional delegation. The depth of my affection for these men has been one of the great pleasures of my congressional career.

EMANUEL CELLER, though of the other party from mine, has joined with me and I with him in many struggles in the House of Representatives, especially for civil rights and civil liberties. His devotion to the best possible relations between the United States and Israel, and the great meaning of that objective to so many of our people in New York, are very well known. I pay him the highest tribute today for the many years of honorable service, in which he has fought many fights so worthwhile for our country, no matter what might be our differences on policy which have arisen in the interim.

As to Mr. JOHN TABER, there are few who are as useful to our country. At his present ripe age of 80, his keen sense of protection of the financial situation of the country is legendary in the House of Representatives, and indeed, in the United States. Our Nation owes him a great debt of gratitude, and I hope no one will be confused by particular questions of policy when they are compared to the enormous service JOHN TABER has rendered to our country as a watchdog of the Treasury. I also pay tribute to the warmth of personality of Mr. TABER, whose friendship I have enjoyed during all the years since I first came to the House of Representatives.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, like the distinguished senior Senator from New York, I, too, served in the House of Representatives for many years, and among my most precious memories are my associations over there. I wish to applaud and associate myself with the tribute the Senator has paid to his colleague from New York, Mr. CELLER. He is an enlightened legislator and a diligent Member of Congress. He is always affable and fair and considerate of those with whom he may disagree. I am very proud of his friendship and of the opportunity I have had to work with him on various matters since I have come to the Senate.

I would not want the record to be closed without paying tribute to my friend JOHN TABER. I do not know of any man in government who has worked more insistently and diligently and determinedly to save the taxpayers money than has JOHN TABER. I have not always shared the viewpoint he has expressed in conference committees and in subcommittees and on the floor, but I have always known that he is an honest man and that he believes in the view-

cent comments against them over Havana radio. In addition, letters from Cuban listeners, testifying to a growing audience for these programs, are beginning to flow into the WRUL offices.

Beaming the truth to people who are denied access to it by government censorship is an old story to this 25-year-old station, which has become known as The Voice of Freedom.

As far back as 1940, WRUL was officially credited with being instrumental in saving 900 merchant ships from Nazi capture.

At that time the station, which has always had an extensive audience aboard ships at sea, broadcast to the Norwegian shipping fleet repeated warnings not to return to their Nazi-occupied home ports.

In 1941, this pioneer international station fed information behind the Nazi lines into the Balkans, with a view toward aiding democratic resistance units in Yugoslavia to spread truth to onset Nazi propaganda.

Following World War II, WRUL aimed programs at Italy, as part of a successful effort to keep Italy from going Communist in a critical national election.

Most recently, WRUL was effective in broadcasting to Latin America the truth about the Communist-inspired riots during the tour of Vice President Nixon.

WRUL was established in 1935 by Walter S. Lemon, president of the station, as a world radio university dedicated to the idea that a private broadcasting station could disseminate education to remote areas of the world by radio.

Approval of the sale of WRUL to the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp., of New York, is pending before the Federal Communications Commission. The Metropolitan Broadcasting Co. now operates the following radio and television stations: WNEW and WNEW-TV, New York City; WIP, Philadelphia; WHK, Cleveland; WTTG, Washington; WTVH, Peoria; and KOVR, Sacramento-Stockton, Calif.

WRUL regularly beams, 7 days a week, to all of Latin America, including the Caribbean, Mexico, Central America, and South America, as well as to Western Europe and Africa. Programs are broadcast in English, Spanish, Portuguese, Norwegian, and Swedish.

Mr. President, I appreciate this opportunity to call the attention of the Senate to WRUL's important new program, which should be helpful in connection with projecting to the Cuban people the true story about the Cuban situation.

TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the Rural Electrification Administration will celebrate its 25th anniversary on Wednesday, May 11, 1960. This is truly a great occasion for a Government program which has become a symbol of rural progress. Almost 5 million farm families throughout our Nation enjoy the

benefits and accomplishments realized under the REA. It is with great pleasure and enthusiasm that I join in paying tribute, during this silver jubilee, to one of the finest and most constructive programs enacted by Congress.

Mr. President, the local rural electric systems, authorized by the REA Act of 1935, are local organizations that build powerlines and provide electric service to farmers and rural areas. They are usually owned by the local people they serve; and, as a result, they are independent business organizations. Capital is borrowed from the Rural Electrification Administration, these interest-bearing loans are repaid to the Government on a regular schedule. Approximately \$4 billion of loans to local systems have been approved by REA; and the repayment record is outstanding. As of December 1, 1959, more than \$823 million in principal had been repaid, and approximately \$397 million in interest had been paid.

The local system obtains its electricity for resale to farmers from private power companies, Federal agencies, and other suppliers. The purchase of electric energy by the REA has increased from 300 million kilowatt-hours in fiscal year 1940 to more than 21 billion kilowatt-hours in 1958.

Today, 96 percent of our farms have electricity, and the average farm uses more than 43 kilowatt-hours a month. Only 10 percent of our farms had electricity when the REA Act was passed in 1935; but today more than one-half of all farms which have electricity are served by the REA. Our American agriculture has actually been converted from the "dark ages" of 1935, when fewer than 11 percent of our farms had electricity, to the brighter years of today, when almost all farms are being served in this way. The REA reports that there are more than 450 ways to use electricity on farms.

In the case of our own State of Mississippi, only 2,802 farms had electricity in 1935. In 1959, 191,900 farms had this service, and 78.3 percent were served by the REA. We now have 53,512 miles of powerlines. Consumption per farm has increased from 40 kilowatt-hours in 1941, and 95 kilowatt-hours in 1950, to over 207 kilowatt-hours in 1958. This illustrates the increased use of electrical equipment on farms and in the home. The REA has given our farmers new hope and a better way of life. It has given added strength to our farm economy and our national economy.

The Rural Electrification Administration was given the new job of supervising rural telephone programs. This was authorized by Congress in 1949. The rural telephone program has the same basic features as does the REA program. Both are lending programs which require that the borrower repay principal and interest within an agreed period of time. We are proud of the record which has been established for repayment of telephone loans in Mississippi. These programs are sound, and they afford to our rural population a great service which

would have been almost impossible without the assistance of the REA.

Mr. President, the relationship between private utilities and the REA in Mississippi has been good. Of course, there have been some differences of opinion; but, as a whole, these differences have been resolved. It is most encouraging that the objective and the ultimate aim of both the REA and the private utilities in my State have been to give the best possible service to their customers.

I am exceptionally proud of the REA systems operating in Mississippi. Here will be found dedicated managers and employees of outstanding ability and leadership. Their primary purpose is to serve farmers. Their foresight and their determination have been responsible for the record of progress made in rural electrification.

Mr. President, I should also like to point out that these outstanding members of the Boards of Directors of the REA serve without compensation. They have given unselfishly of their time and ability, and have made great contributions to the success of this program. They have furnished guidance, direction, and sound business judgment in the operation of the local systems.

As an example of the record of progress made by the REA, I point with pride to the East Mississippi Electric Power Association, which has served my own home county since 1939. It organized with a total of 342 members and with 30 miles of line, 5 employees, a plant investment of \$40,232, and a total annual payroll of \$1,412. In its first year of operation it distributed 269,783 kilowatt-hours. As of April 1960 the East Mississippi Electric Power Association has 3,257 miles of line in operation, serves 12,500 rural families, and distributed 48,147,346 kilowatt-hours in the past 12 months. It now has a plant investment of \$6 million and an annual payroll of approximately \$281,000. This is truly great progress, and is typical of the accomplishments being made by our REA systems in Mississippi.

Mr. President, the REA has greatly changed the living conditions of rural people, by bringing to them such necessities as running water, sanitary conditions, electric stoves, electric heating, refrigeration, motors for farm labor, milking machines, and refrigeration equipment for the sanitation of milk production and egg production. The REA has made modern farm living a reality.

There are many, many other ways in which electricity has lightened farm chores. In the years ahead we shall see new and better electric machines come to farms. Electricity will continue to make a more comfortable and more profitable way of life for our farm people. We can anticipate with confidence that the REA will rise to the challenge of meeting the growing farm demands for electricity. On this 25th anniversary I salute the Rural Electrification Administration for the truly great contribution it has made to agriculture and for the outstanding leadership which has made this progress possible.

1960

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

9113

power and maintains power by conspiratorial methods. Soviet espionage has reaped a rich harvest by such methods, especially against friendly and unsuspecting countries.

I read now from the Internal Security Subcommittee publication, "Soviet Political Agreements and Results," a staff study published in 1959:

May 10, 1948: Costa Rica broke relations with the U.S.S.R., because the Costa Rican Communist Party with the help of international communism had taken control of the government, which provoked a civil war.

The same document tells us, Mr. President, that Brazil, Chile, Cuba, Venezuela, Israeli, Australia, Guatemala, and Iraq have all suspended diplomatic relations with the U.S.S.R. since World War II. The same document tells us that:

The Canadian Government ordered home G. F. Popov, Second Secretary of the Soviet Embassy, because he was engaged in espionage.

The United Nations ordered home Viktor Ivanovich Petrov, a Russian employee of its Secretariat, because he was engaged in espionage.

Last summer, Alexander Urevitch Kaznachoev fled from his post in the Soviet Embassy in Rangoon and took refuge in the U.S. Embassy. He told the Associated Press that the main occupation of all the Soviet Embassy staff—in Rangoon—is to spy.

Kaznachoev appeared before the subcommittee on December 14, 1959, to tell of his espionage activities under the orders of the Kremlin. He told us that his espionage chief in Rangoon was Ivan Vozsiy, who masqueraded as First Secretary of the Soviet Embassy.

J. Edgar Hoover, who knows more about this subject than any man in the United States, summarized the story in a speech made before the United American Mechanics in Charleston, W. Va., on June 16, 1959, as follows:

As the No. 1 target of worldwide communism, the United States is the prime objective of Soviet espionage. Soviet defectors are unanimous in stating that between 70 and 80 percent of Russian officials in the United States are members of the Red Intelligence Services. The importance that the U.S.S.R. is currently attaching to the value of these intelligence agents is vividly borne out by the sharp increase in the number of Soviet diplomatic personnel assigned to the United States. In May, 1954, there were 212 Soviet officials in the United States. Five years later that number has increased to 313, or an increase of almost 50 percent.

Soviet espionage activities in this country expose the fallacy of so-called peaceful co-existence in recent years; pseudo appeals for peace by Communists have been more than matched by intensified Communist espionage efforts in the United States. Using blackmail, bribery, and similar techniques, Communist agents, many which diplomatic immunity, are stepping up their efforts to obtain our military, scientific, and industrial secrets for use against us.

Mr. Hoover intently analyzed the 17th National Convention of the Communist Party, U.S.A., which was held in December 1959. The Subcommittee on Internal Security published his findings. Here is a part of what he said:

The party will remain in the future—as it has been in the past—an obedient slave of Moscow. No new personalities were brought into the party's top leadership. Rather, leadership is today exercised by the

same corps of hardened, disciplined, veteran Communists who feel that Moscow represents the final goal of all of mankind's hopes. So-called rightwing Communists are not represented. They have either voluntarily resigned in complete disillusionment or been coldbloodedly purged.

The Communist conspiracy in America today is led by a man who has openly boasted that he was willing to take up arms and fight to overthrow our form of Government. Hall was convicted in Minneapolis, Minn., in 1934, in connection with a riot there when he was a member of the Young Communist League. During his trial he testified as follows:

"Question. But you would prefer the Russian—you would prefer to be in Russia?"

"Answer. I prefer America with a Soviet Government."

"Question. And you are willing to fight and overthrow this Government?"

"Answer. Absolutely."

"Question. And you are willing to take up arms and overthrow the constituted authorities?"

"Answer. When the time comes, 'Yes.'"

Only a few weeks ago, the Subcommittee on Internal Security summoned Hall to the witness stand and read him the words I have just quoted to you and gave him opportunity to disavow them. He refused it.

Mr. President, it is my suggestion that we not lost our heads at the revelation that the free world uses espionage to defend itself.

Let us look at the headwaters of the stream.

Let us remember the words of the Communist manifesto:

The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions.

AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY FORUM TO EXPLORE THE NATURE OF PEACE IN THE COMING YEARS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to a rather unusual seminar which is to be held here in Washington tomorrow night. It will be cosponsored by the American Peace Society and the American University, and will be held in the School of International Service Lounge on the American University campus, Massachusetts and Nebraska Avenues NW., on Wednesday, May 11, at 8 p.m.

Participating in the seminar will be a group of distinguished experts on the subject of "The Redefinition of Peace." Dr. Stefan Possany, professor of government at Georgetown University, will discuss "The Communist Requirements for Peace." Dr. William Yandell Elliot, of Harvard University, will speak on the subject "Our National Peace Policy." Dr. Bonaro Overstreet, the coauthor of a recent bestselling book on communism, who has just returned from a trip to the Soviet Union, will speak about "New Ways to an American Contribution to Peace." The moderator for the forum will be a distinguished former Member of this body, Hon. Homer Ferguson, who now serves as chief judge of the U.S. Court of Military Appeals.

Mr. President, I urge all who can do so to attend this interesting discussion of the nature of peace in the years ahead.

Fresh and imaginative thinking on this topic is of supreme importance as we approach the summit conference and the crises which must inevitably lie ahead, and I am confident much food for thought will emerge from this seminar.

The American Peace Society, which has long pioneered in this vital field, is the oldest peace society in America. Its cosponsorship of this forum is in keeping with the high traditions and leadership of the society, and I hope many people will take advantage of the opportunity represented by this forum.

WRUL BROADCASTS TO CUBA

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, several weeks ago I pointed out on the floor of the Senate that Cuba's lack of a free press had made it virtually impossible for the Cuban people to get the facts about what is happening in their homeland. I stated that in view of these conditions, it is imperative that the United States embark on a truth campaign which will bring our side of the story to Cuba.

Since making that statement on the floor, I have been advised that station WRUL, the international broadcasting station, has launched a series of truth programs for Cuba, in an effort to pierce the curtain of censorship drawn by the Castro government over all press, radio, and television in Cuba.

According to information which has been furnished to me by the station, WRUL recently began a series of nightly—Monday through Friday—broadcasts sponsored by a group of Cuban exiles who have banded together in Miami to create a program series called *Por Cuba y Para Cuba—On Behalf of Cuba and For Cuba*. These Spanish-language programs are broadcast from 9 to 9:30 p.m., e.s.t., on the shortwave 19 meter band at 15.38 megacycles and on the 25 meter band at 11.83 megacycles, over radio beams directed across Cuba.

The director of the program series is Andres Vargas-Gomez, the former Cuban Ambassador to the United Nations in Europe, who last month resigned in Geneva, Switzerland, after rejecting the Castro administration as Communist inspired.

The programs feature the voices of two brothers Pedro and Rene Leyva both of whom worked on the Castro-confiscated Havana newspaper *Advance*. Pedro, 32, had been a columnist for that newspaper. Rene, 46, was news editor, before both were exiled by Dr. Castro.

Each day, Mr. Vargas-Gomez and his staff cull from Cuban newspapers flown to Miami items which they know to be propaganda. The programs' producers compare these items with the verified facts and with reports from friends inside Cuba who smuggle information into the "Para Cuba" headquarters in Miami.

The programs are then recorded in a secret studio in Miami, and are relayed to the WRUL studios in New York City. They are then edited and played back at 9 p.m. over the station's powerful shortwave transmitters in Massachusetts.

Indication of the impact of these broadcasts is evidenced by Castro's re-

MAY 9, 1960

Approved For Release 2004/05/13 : CIA-RDP90T00782R000100050001-8

If Reds Hold U.S. Pilot, America's Duty Is Clear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. J. CARLTON LOSER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 9, 1960

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner, which points up rather clearly America's duty in connection with the unfortunate occurrence of a few days ago when Francis Gerry Powers was allegedly shot down over Soviet Russia. The very minimum demands of our State Department in connection with this matter are set forth in this editorial; namely, access to Powers by our Ambassador, to interrogate him on the facts of the case; to provide counsel, looking forward to his early release, and to assure the protection to which he is entitled in any trial contemplated. The editorial follows:

[From the Nashville Banner, May 7, 1960]
IF REDS HOLD U.S. PILOT, AMERICA'S DUTY
IS CLEAR

If, as Nikita Khrushchev now boasts, Russia is holding the pilot of an American plane shot down over Soviet territory on May 1, justice decrees direct access to him by U.S. authorities, both to establish the truth of the case and to assure the protection to which he is entitled by full, official representation in any "trial" contemplated.

America does not and cannot take the Soviet word for what has happened. It cannot blindly accept either the report that Francis Gerry Powers is in custody, or that, under whatever circumstances, he has "confessed" to charges conveniently rigged to suit Khrushchev's propaganda purposes.

Ambassador Llewellyn B. Thompson is this Nation's representative in Russia—both available and by duty commissioned to bear its responsibilities in that land. Certainly he has every right to demand access to the

reported prisoner, to interrogate him on the facts of the case by which America's own course will be doubly clarified, and to provide counsel, looking to his immediate release.

That the allegations to date incorporate a tissue of lies is evident not only from information at hand respecting Powers' assignment in Europe—the mission on which his single-motor, unarmed plane was engaged from its base in Turkey—but in Khrushchev's bombastic claim that he was shot down by some "powerful" new "rocket," of unerring, single-shot accuracy. For now it is claimed that he bailed out.

President Eisenhower has indicated as of yesterday that he is calling off his scheduled visit to Russia. Such a decision is in order, as this newspaper observed when the case broke. He also should notify Khrushchev that he is attending no summit conference so long as this state of renewed tensions, deliberately revived by the Soviet, persists. They menace the discussions, and assuredly foredoom them to failure.

Specifically, he could instruct the Kremlin that he is not going to the Soviet unless and until Pilot Francis Gerry Powers is free, and a full apology has been received for this whole infamous incident.

Let the whole world be on notice that America does not do business, nor fraternize, with outlaws. It must yield to neither the blandishments nor the blackmail of this enemy.

TAB

1960

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A3961

business as intervenor at the plant. Mr. Caceres' first action was to dismiss Mr. Vincent Pedre, a native Cuban with 34 years continuous service at Otis, 23 of which were spent as the manager of the Cuban plant.

Immediately following are the claims presented by the minister of labor as justification for the intervention at the Otis plant—and in contrast, the facts in connection with each assertion:

MEMORANDUM BY OTIS ELEVATOR CO.

Subject: Intervention of Otis Elevator Co., Cuba.

On November 19, 1924, Otis Elevator Co., a corporation formed under the laws of the State of Maine, United States of America, was registered in Havana to do business in Cuba and since that time it has actively carried on the business of installing and servicing elevators and escalators.

For the past 25 years all of the permanent employees of Otis Elevator Co. in Cuba have been Cuban citizens and the number of employees on its payroll at the end of 1958 totaled 201. Of this total number of employees 36 were in the office, 59 were engaged in servicing elevators, and the remaining 106 were assigned to the installation of elevators in new buildings.

On December 23, 1959, Mr. Julio Caceres presented to the Otis office in Havana a resolution of the minister of labor dated the same day which appointed Mr. Julio Caceres the intervenor and empowered him, pursuant to law 647 of November 24, 1959, to intervene the company and assume full charge of its operation.

Mr. Julio Caceres is a native of Guatemala, 23 years of age, and we understand arrived in Cuba during April 1959. So far as we know, Mr. Caceres has had no experience in the elevator business.

Mr. Caceres' first action was to dismiss the Otis manager, Mr. Vincent Pedre, a native of Cuba who has been in the employ of the company for 34 years and as manager of Otis in Cuba for the past 23 years. Mr. Pedre is thoroughly experienced in the elevator business, both from a technical and managerial point of view.

The claims outlined in the attached resolution by the minister of labor as a justification for the intervention are completely unfounded and in order that there be no question on this point, the facts in connection with the claims made by the minister of labor are hereinafter stated:

1. It is claimed that the attitude assumed by the employer toward the workers is not satisfactory but the claim is not specific.

The fact is that for the past several decades, prior to the revolution in 1959, the labor and employee relations with the management of the Otis organization in Cuba had been normal.

2. It is claimed that the company refuses to discuss workers collective agreement presented by the laborers.

This is not a fact because the revolutionary minister of labor on August 24, 1959, advised the Otis management as well as Mr. Vincente Gonzalez, secretary-general of the local union, that further discussion of the workers collective agreement would be postponed until after arriving at a formula for the release of some 60 surplus temporary construction men who had been working on the installation of elevators in new buildings.

This same minister, several weeks later after studying Otis' case thoroughly, agreed that all surplus workers could be released under a formula which was perfectly acceptable to both Otis and the union. However, before the decision could be implemented, the minister was replaced by another and all attempts to reopen the discussion on this subject with the new minister were unsuccessful.

Early in 1959 the end of an unprecedented building boom occurred when such large buildings as the Havana Hilton Hotel, Hotel Capri, Palacio Municipal, Hospital Nacional, Seguro del Medico, Hospital Mercedes, Hijas de Galicia, Terminal de Helicoptro, Inmobiliario Golfo San Lazaro, reached completion.

In accordance with normal construction procedure, the Otis men assigned to the installation of elevators in these buildings became surplus when and as the elevator installations were completed and as many of these men were engaged originally as temporary constructors, they would under normal conditions have been released. The minister of labor, however, refused to allow Otis to discharge these temporary constructors even though Otis had no further work for them. In spite of this decision the company continued to negotiate with the workers and at the same time to plead its case with the minister of labor for the discharge of these surplus employees right up until August 24, 1959.

3. It is claimed that the company refused to allow the surplus employees, who were still being paid by the company, to be given actual work on the job.

The fact here is obvious—there was no work to give the men. Otis made every possible effort to find work for the surplus employees even to the extent of advancing all repair work schedules.

The minister of labor when he refused to permit the dismissal of the surplus employees early in 1959, agreed that if the company paid the employees and allowed them to use their time as they desired, the company would be fulfilling its obligation. This the company did and for many months Otis paid the surplus employees, which eventually totaled 60 in number, their full wages.

The intervenor has already assigned these surplus construction employees to—

(a) Installations from which the company had withdrawn its construction workers due to the nonpayment of contract obligation of the part of the owner. This contract protection against nonpayment has therefore been removed by the intervenor; and

(b) Other jobs which were adequately managed thus creating the practice of featherbedding.

It should be pointed out here that the construction business is of a cyclical nature and that the fluctuations in the volume of employment of construction workers must conform with the trend of construction contract awards. To attempt to maintain a constant volume of employment under the conditions prevalent in the building industry in Cuba over the past year is economically impossible.

4. It is claimed that the company threatened to close the office and did not attempt to secure new orders for the installation of elevators, as well as quoting unreasonably high prices in order to avoid obtaining new business, which all resulted in the slow dissolution of an enterprise where a large number of workers render their services.

These claims are completely unfounded in that Otis has taken no action to close its business in Cuba and it has submitted reasonably priced bids on new projects for elevators throughout 1959 with necessary credit precautions.

Why Otis Elevator Co. would consider withdrawing from such a market after 25 years of satisfactory operations in Cuba is hard to conceive.

Throughout the difficult period of 1959 Dr. Esteban Ferrer, attorney of the firm Bufete, Salaya-Casteleiro, has acted as our legal counsel and had continually assisted Otis in the filing of appeals to the Government, particularly to the Ministry of Labor. On January 6, 1960, Dr. Ferrer filed an appeal with the supreme court of Cuba for the re-

moval of the intervenor and the restoration of the business to Otis Elevator Co. on the ground that the intervention was unconstitutional.

The total loss to which Otis Elevator Co. is subjected from the intervention of its Cuban business is approximately \$500,000, not including past and prospective earning capacity.

Another concern arising from this intervention is the treatment to which Otis Elevator Co. is now being subjected after 35 years of continuous operations in Cuba, its employment of Cuban citizens, and its contribution to the economic development of the Republic of Cuba.

This memorandum is submitted in the hope that our Government may be of assistance to the Otis Elevator Co. in securing the restitution of the Otis interest in Cuba.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very disturbing report. I am deeply concerned. Fidel Castro and his government must be held accountable for any property belonging to the United States or her nationals that is seized without adequate compensation.

This particular action of Dr. Castro happens to be a direct blow to the people of my city of Yonkers, where is located the Otis elevator plant which has supplied the Cuban company with millions of dollars' worth of manufactured equipment. As a result of this seizure in Cuba, many jobs may be lost.

I would like to invite my colleagues' attention to these facts. It is clear that some way must be found to see to it that American property owners in Cuba are adequately compensated for these seizures.

Supreme Lack of Coordination in U-2 Incident

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHESTER BOWLES

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 3, 1960

Mr. BOWLES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a statement which I released earlier today on the controversy over the U-2 incident. The statement follows:

SUPREME LACK OF COORDINATION IN U-2 INCIDENT

People throughout the world have been profoundly shocked and disturbed by the news that an American espionage plane was shot down over the Soviet Union. There is no doubt that our Government has suffered a serious setback at a critical moment. As an incident this one is likely to go down in history as the greatest single item of national embarrassment in the 8 years of the Eisenhower administration. As a symbol of what is basically wrong with the present conduct of our foreign policy, it is of even greater importance. I am conscious of the delicacy of the situation itself. I am aware that while the administration has been embarrassed by these events, all Americans are embarrassed with it. I do not wish to add personal or partisan fuel to the controversy which will be raging for weeks ahead on this issue. Nor do I wish, in anything I say, to imply that I have any more information, official or unofficial, on the intelligence aspects of this case than does any other American citizen.

A3962

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

May 9

As I said on television yesterday afternoon ("Meet the Press," NBC-TV, Sunday, May 8, 1960):

"I don't think any one of us as outsiders can know what is essential in the way of espionage. We are all realists. We all know that this is a difficult and complex world. We know we are at a disadvantage, that the Soviet is a closed police state and has certain very great advantages over us. I don't know the inside story of how much information we have or what we lack or what risks should be required to get it. I would assume that we should not do this sort of thing for a marginal gain.

"But we are preparing for a summit meeting. The whole history of the world may depend upon our ability to negotiate with the Soviet Union. We are in a very delicate position and certainly this would be a time to be far more circumspect than obviously these people have been. I think they have committed a very gross case of misjudgment and I think it is highly reckless, dangerous, and hurtful."

Here, as I see them, are the unalterable, embarrassing facts which now face us:

1. The State Department has been caught in a dramatic falsehood. The Department may have been the victim of misinformation provided by other Government agencies. Nevertheless, foreign governments—both friendly and otherwise—are bound to press the point that the word of the U.S. State Department can no longer be trusted. In international negotiations, as in personal relationships, lack of trust is damaging and costly.

2. If the flight really was not authorized in Washington, the incident demonstrates that the President has been kept in ignorance of critically important developments and activities within our own Government. This, in turn, seriously undermines the prestige of the President at a time when the world urgently needs his strength and influence in behalf of peace.

3. The Russian suspicions of our good faith in negotiating the control and inspection systems which are essential to disarmament programs have been increased. As a result, we will find them even more difficult to deal with on these critical questions at the Summit.

4. We have placed ourselves in a defensive position in our efforts to negotiate a step by step relaxation in cold war tensions. In contrast the Soviet position has been greatly strengthened. It is safe to assume that the Kremlin will use its advantage to the limit in mustering world opinion against us.

Hence this incident adds up to a devastating loss of faith in the quality of American leadership: A loss of faith in the reliability and straightforwardness of official U.S. statements; a loss of faith in the President's role in the conduct of critical policy matters; and a loss of faith in U.S. sincerity in easing tensions in advance of the summit meeting.

The role of clandestine operations is inherently difficult for a democracy. I do not underestimate it. But that is an argument for greater Presidential control, not less. The astonishment and incredulity of many millions of Americans today over the headlines is magnified by the knowledge that our President and his administration are simply not in control of their own operations. The bumbling nature of this whole incident—the supreme lack of coordination between one Department of our Government and the others—this is what is so serious and what merits our strongest dismay.

It symbolizes what is chiefly wrong with this administration's record in foreign policy. Indeed we can generalize from this instance.

The administration is uncoordinated. No one is in control. The State Department is not—it doesn't even know what some of our military and intelligence people are doing.

The President is not a master in his own house. Each sector of the administration undermines another.

This has been the story all along—on defense, on disarmament, on foreign aid. No one has a firm grasp on where we are headed. Lacking overall goals, we continually let means get in the way of ends. Our military policy defeats our economic policy. Our intelligence policy defeats our diplomatic policy. Our short-term requirements defeat our long-term ones.

This Government and this Nation simply cannot survive piecemeal, uncoordinated administration where our vital national interests are clearly at stake.

This incident, embarrassing, dangerous, and damaging as we know it to be, may in the long run prove to be worthwhile if it will wake America and the world to the hideous dangers of this cold war struggle.

Every thoughtful person must now see that we are walking a tightrope in world affairs. Miscalculations either in Moscow or in Washington could plunge us all into a war that no one wants, that no one could win, and from which few could survive. The stupendous dangers we face have been clearly dramatized.

What is required of us now is a bipartisan effort to break the logjam in world affairs and to embark on a new study of methods to ease our way gradually out of the impasse into which the world has stumbled and to begin to lay the foundation for a meaningful peace.

In saying this, I do not suggest that peace will come easily. On the contrary, the difficulties are enormous. I simply say that it is time that mankind took charge of its own destiny while we still have the opportunity to act rationally.

Substantial Pay Raises for Postal and Federal Employees Urged by Mrs. Maurine B. Neuberger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 6, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following testimony by Mrs. Maurine Neuberger in support of pay increases for postal and Federal employees. Mrs. Neuberger appeared before the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee on May 5, 1960.

Her husband, the late Oregon Senator, served for almost 6 years as a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. In 1958 Dick Neuberger was chairman of the Federal Pay Subcommittee which wrote the long-needed legislation giving Federal and postal employees a 10-percent pay raise.

Maurine Neuberger worked closely with her husband. In her testimony she has pointed up deficiencies which concerned Senator Neuberger and her. I was particularly interested in her observation that some agencies of the Government have realized the expense of today's high cost of living. She told the committee:

The Federal Housing Administration indicated that a letter carrier does not make enough money to purchase a \$15,000 house.

With minimum down payment a \$15,000 house on a 30-year mortgage payment requires an annual income of \$5,384, but the letter carrier in the top longevity grade with 25 years of service receives only \$5,175 a year.

The lumber industry is a major industry in Oregon. The inability of people to purchase homes they need starts a chain reaction which affects our economy adversely.

Mrs. Neuberger's full testimony follows:

TESTIMONY BY MRS. MAURINE NEUBERGER IN SUPPORT OF PAY INCREASES FOR POSTAL AND FEDERAL EMPLOYEES, SENATE POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE

Mr. Chairman and members of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, my name is Mrs. Maurine B. Neuberger, of Portland, Oreg., wife of the late Senator Richard L. Neuberger who served for many years as a member of your committee. I am pleased to have the opportunity of testifying in support of needed pay increases to our postal and Federal employees.

The administration spokesmen tell us that wage increases must wait, must wait for the completion of studies currently being made by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. We are told that these studies may be completed by December, and that if we wait until January of next year Congress then can consider wage increases based on the results of this study.

Of course by waiting this administration will leave office on January 20, 1961, and a new administration may well want to take a look at pay proposals for Federal and postal employees. In other words, what the Eisenhower administration is suggesting is to brush under the carpet vitally needed wage increases and wait for the next administration.

As your committee well knows, the whole history of pay legislation for Federal employees under the present administration has been one of inaction and veto. Three times Congress has passed wage increases for Federal employees which were vetoed by the President—in 1954, 1957, and 1958. We were successful in getting through in 1955 a 7-percent pay increase which was scaled down to meet administration objections, and a 10-cent pay increase in 1956 which was coupled with postal rate increases desired by the administration.

It is indeed ironic that this administration can spend billions for higher interest rates and cannot pay adequate salaries to its employees. For example, the cost of managing the interest on the Federal debt in fiscal 1958 was \$6.5 billion. The estimated cost of interest in 1961 is \$9.5 billion—1 percent of estimated 1961 budget expenditures. In fact, what the administration is telling us is "billions for interest; nothing for Federal employees."

While the administration prepares its so-called vital surveys of wage rates in its last year of office the Mitchell-Nixon settlement of the steel strike provided important new benefits for steelworkers. Steelworkers received a minimum 6½-cent immediate wage increase by company absorption of all health and welfare costs. Wages are pegged to the cost of living, and additional wage increases are provided effective the first of next year. Is it fair for the administration to sponsor pay increases for steelworkers and shift its responsibility to Government employees? What about the inflationary effects for steelworkers and steel which is an item so important in our industrial society, as well as the high interest rates for those fortunate enough to hold Government and private notes?

Millions of Government employees cannot wait to eat and to live but must go ahead with their own individual family lives. For example, a letter carrier after 21 years of

TAB

U-2 INCIDENT AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

(Mr. WOLF (at the request of Mr. McCormack) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point.)

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, the lesson we should have learned from the experience of the U-2 is how quickly, in international relations, great powers can be brought to the brink of war, and, in truth, we should thank God that the world has not come to this. It would behoove us to think who God and the people of the United States have trusted with their topmost leadership to spend a little time in serious meditation about the awful consequences of such obstructionist tactics in the question of nuclear control.

Yesterday's column by Marquis Childs had a tremendously sobering effect on me, and I believe, should be seriously studied by everyone. Marquis Childs is known for his serious and analytic editorial opinion, and the following quote must take on added significance:

If a treaty fails to be agreed to because of what seem to be obstructionist tactics from the American side or if a treaty is rejected by the Senate, the Western alliance will be split apart and the United States put in the position of standing almost alone in the world.

His further comment is equally significant:

Furthermore, the British here believe that it would have been possible to get a treaty with adequate guarantees any time during the past 9 months if it had not been for America's delaying tactics.

[From the Washington Post, May 11, 1960]
 UNITED STATES ON THE SPOT IN GENEVA TALKS
 (By Marquis Childs)

GENEVA.—The incidents of the past few days are readymade for those who want to continue the cold war and who have persistently by every means sought to prevent any meaningful negotiation with the Soviet Union. Here in Geneva, where a negotiation has been going on for 18 months, this is seen in the sharpest and most dramatic fashion.

The announcement from Gettysburg by President Eisenhower that the United States intends to resume nuclear explosions for research purposes fits the pattern. It was made without any notice to the American delegation. More important, it came as the three powers—Great Britain, the United States, and the Soviet Union—were trying to get agreement on a joint program of research into improved methods for detecting nuclear explosions.

What is little understood is the way in which the Soviets have made one concession after another, coming around time after time to the Western view. They began by saying they would not discuss any control system until after a treaty on general principles had been signed. After 4 months they agreed to talk about how a control system would function in the Soviet Union and the United States.

They came around to agreeing to a discussion by scientists from each country on the problem of underground identification. Having said they would never agree to a threshold and a moratorium outside a nuclear test treaty on explosions below that threshold, they finally accepted this position. They would never accept our criteria for detection which they called absurd, but they accepted them.

With literally dozens of concessions by the Soviets, the outline of a treaty has evolved. Major issues—the number of inspections in each country, the makeup of a control commission, the length of the moratorium—remain to be determined presumably by the heads of government when they meet in Paris.

The American negotiator through all these long, trying months has been James J. Wadsworth, who is deputy head of the American delegation to the United Nations. Wadsworth's Western colleagues say he has shown more skill, patience, and persistence in dealing with the Russians than any other American since the end of World War II.

What has made Wadsworth's position doubly difficult is that, while inching the Russians up little by little to the Western view, he has constantly been fighting a rear-guard action with those in Washington who have been determined to block any treaty. In this context, the Gettysburg announcement is seen as the latest attempt to sabotage the negotiation. While no one will say this officially, it is the view of observers close to the conference for many months.

No one would accuse President Eisenhower of such an intention. But since he has not followed at close range the complex negotiations, he must take his lead from one faction or another. And while the committee of principals dealing with this matter at the top level of Government in Washington is reportedly in favor of a test treaty with proper inspection and control by a majority of four to one, the minority in the Pentagon and the Atomic Energy Commission has shown great resourcefulness in blocking tactics.

There should be no illusions back home about the situation the United States confronts. If a treaty fails to be agreed to because of what seem to be obstructionist tactics from the American side, or if a treaty is rejected by the Senate, the Western alliance will be split apart and the United States put in the position of standing almost alone in the world. Here are the reasons why:

The Conservative Government in London has never wavered in the determination to get a treaty that would mean the beginning of inspection behind the Iron Curtain and perhaps the beginning of a pattern of disarmament. They concede the risk of some cheating under any control system, but they believe this is minimal and is heavily outweighed by the gain of a beginning at inspection and control.

Opinion in Britain is virtually unanimous on this score, as it is in the Scandinavian countries, West Germany, and most of Asia and Africa. Furthermore, the British here believe that it would have been possible to get a treaty with adequate guarantees any time during the past 9 months if it had not been for America's delaying tactics.

MAY 12 1960

Approved For Release 2004/05/13 : CIA-RDP90T00782R000100050001-8

THE ISSUE IS THE IRON CURTAIN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the world is now waiting to see just how far Mr. Khrushchev will go in his political "propaganda tantrum" over the flight of the U-2 plane over Soviet territory.

Frankly, I believe Mr. Khrushchev's blasts are primarily for home consumption. His country's "economic pains" and the growing awareness of the intellectuals of his denial of their political freedom have required this diversionary tactic. The downing of the plane provided a launching pad for a blast into orbit, propagandawise. The world can only guess how far he will go.

The wild foray of Khrushchev's blasts and accusations—many of which, if carefully analyzed, are found to be reiterations of old themes—raise this question: Will he jeopardize the summit conference? Will he carry through his suggestion of calling off the President's visit to the Soviet Union? Will he create greater world tensions and furor?

These questions are unanswered in the world's mind.

In addition to a condition of "less than harmony" at home, I believe that Khrushchev's suggested efforts to withdraw the invitation to President Eisenhower to visit the Soviet Union may well be because of his fear of the impact such a visit might have upon the people of Russia.

At a summit conference—if held—we must recognize also that the goals of the East and the West may be at cross purposes. The West is striving to establish a firm foundation upon which to build a lasting peace.

As yet, it has not been possible to conclude that the Soviets want anything else except to find ways and means to further their still avowed goal of world domination. In effect, Khrushchev does not want peace. Rather, he wants to take the world, "piece by piece." His furor demonstrates that the "issue" of the Iron Curtain is one of the major causes of tension. Khrushchev will be lucky indeed if the furor he is creating does not backfire, by disclosure of the chain of spying, espionage, and subversion which the Communists are carrying out in countries all around the globe.

Wisely, President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Herter, are keeping their eyes on the fundamental goals.

The New York Times today published a constructive editorial entitled "The Issue Is the Iron Curtain." The editorial sheds new light upon this situation, now clouded by Soviet propaganda. Therefore, I request unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE ISSUE IS THE IRON CURTAIN

In the face of Premier Khrushchev's campaign to heat up the cold war atmosphere

over an incident in rival espionage, President Eisenhower is making a valiant effort to keep world attention focused on the real issues of the day so that the work of safeguarding peace may proceed. These issues, as he again outlined them in his press conference yesterday, are controlled disarmament, Germany and Berlin, and, as a problem suddenly most pressing, East-West relations, in which the Iron Curtain plays a decisive role.

To cope with these issues the President announced that he is going to the East-West summit meeting, beginning in Paris next Monday, and that he still plans to visit Soviet Russia, Japan and Korea. This dispels any doubts about his attendance at the summit. Moreover, far from shirking the issue of the downed American reconnaissance plane, the President proposes to use this very incident to challenge the Soviets to abolish the Iron Curtain as a major cause of suspicion and world tension.

To this end he will again propose his "open skies" plan, which would open up Soviet Russia to the same kind of aerial inspection which the West itself is willing to accept and thereby eliminate the fear of a surprise attack. Until this is done, he warned, the United States will continue its intelligence work as a distasteful but essential work, both to safeguard this Nation against an atomic Pearl Harbor and to deter any Soviet attack on the free world.

Somewhat along the same line the President also announced that Soviet observers will be invited to attend the new underground explosions planned by the United States. These explosions are to be part of the joint research program to which the Soviets have agreed in order to find adequate means of detecting underground tests.

Unfortunately, even as the President spoke, Foreign Minister Gromyko announced in Moscow that the Soviets will again reject the "open skies" plan, as they did in 1955, and that Soviet skies will remain closed. Premier Khrushchev's latest contribution was to cast such doubt on the wisdom of President Eisenhower's visit to Moscow as in effect to qualify the invitation. As for the feigned Soviet indignation over the American plane, its real character is exposed by the American photographs of Soviet planes reconnoitering over Western bases and by the arrest as spies of two Soviet Embassy members in Switzerland.

1960

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

9389

statement by the distinguished junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE].

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR McGEE

Today marks the 50th anniversary of service performed by Vernon Talbertt. Vernon, as he is affectionately known to us in the Senate, has served with dignity and distinction. He has been especially helpful to new Members and their staffs as they assume their duties in the Senate; and I am pleased to join my colleagues in paying tribute to this outstanding employee. I wish him well, and trust he will be able to serve the Senate for another 50 years.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, it is hard for those of us who have recently come to the Senate to contemplate the full import of 50 years of service to this body. Vernon L. Talbertt, the Chief Messenger in the Office of the Secretary of the Senate, who today celebrates his golden anniversary as a Senate employee, was going about his tasks before many of us were born.

There is little one can say that compensates for so many years of steady and devoted service. If his satisfaction in a job well done is half as great as that of the Senate, this should indeed be a gratifying day for him.

From the first time I met Vernon, and on every subsequent occasion, he has been pleasant, courteous, devoted, and efficient. I am sure the many men in public life whom he has served could say the same. We all wish him well.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I feel genuinely privileged to have the opportunity of joining with my colleagues today in honoring a man who has given unselfishly of his confidence, service, and ability to the Senate of the United States for half a century.

To me, Vernon Talbertt, the Chief Messenger of the Office of the Secretary, a man who has served eight Secretaries of the Senate, typifies the high purpose and genuine loyalty that pervades this great institution and which motivates all of the employees and staff that serve in making our Government work.

His devotion to duty and quiet efficiency attracted my attention when I first came to the Senate, and the high opinion of this man that I formed then remains to this day.

I look forward to his continued employment in the Senate and hope he will be with us for many more years.

RETIREMENT OF SENATOR JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I was saddened to learn that my good friend the senior Senator from Wyoming, has decided to retire. Having made a similar decision last month, I realize how difficult it is to weigh conflicting personal, family, and political desires. JOE O'MAHONEY has richly earned the right to lay aside the duties and demands of office, but the Senate will suffer a great loss from his absence.

JOE O'MAHONEY was one of four Members now in the Senate serving when I

came here 26 years ago. Then already, with years of prior experience on Capitol Hill as secretary to the late Senator Kendrick, JOE O'MAHONEY was highly trained in the technicalities of government; and his counsel to me and other incoming Senators was invaluable, as it has been through the years.

I recall with pleasure and was proud of my years of service with him when he was chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which accomplished so much for our country. Subsequently, I became chairman, and when JOE O'MAHONEY returned to the Senate I was pleased that he also returned to the Interior Committee, to which he contributed so much in wise counsel and sound judgment.

Mr. President, I wish to mention two great endeavors of Senator O'MAHONEY which illustrate the foresight that has characterized his legislative endeavors. He was coauthor of the O'Mahoney-Milliken amendment, which reserves to upper basin States the use of waters arising in those States prior to use for navigation. Rural electric cooperative leaders in the upper Missouri basin have an ever-deepening appreciation of this provision of law, enacted 16 years ago, and now being cited in protection of our rights.

Perhaps JOE O'MAHONEY's greatest contribution to this Nation was his brilliant leadership as chairman of the Temporary National Economic Committee. I think it is fair to state that the TNEC study, conducted by JOE O'MAHONEY, was the first exhaustive, thorough and workmanlike evaluation of this Nation's economy. The TNEC study laid some of the groundwork for the Employment Act of 1946, and JOE O'MAHONEY properly served, with distinction, as first chairman of the Joint Committee established by the Employment Act of 1946.

I wish you good health, JOE, and many pleasant years of retirement for you and Mrs. O'Mahoney.

PROSPECTIVE RETIREMENT OF SENATOR O'MAHONEY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, when I heard that my dear friend, Senator O'MAHONEY, had made up his mind not to be a candidate for reelection, that announcement brought back memories of my association with him, through the years, on subcommittees of the Judiciary Committee. At this same time, I should like to pay a brief tribute to this distinguished and outstanding Member of the Senate.

Mr. President, in the last 2 days several Members of this body have expressed their regrets because of the announcement of the very able senior Senator from Wyoming that he will not be a candidate for reelection. My good colleague from Texas, the majority leader, appropriately commented that few men who have served in this body have rendered more dedicated or more patriotic service than has the Senator from Wyoming, Senator JOSEPH O'MAHONEY.

The senior Senator from New York, who was acting minority leader during the Tuesday session, paid his tribute as

a Republican to Senator O'MAHONEY and to his unusual abilities as a lawyer.

I should like to add a few comments relating to the dedicated work and accomplishments of Senator O'MAHONEY, with whom I have had the pleasure of serving in the U.S. Senate and on its committees for more than 20 years.

Senator O'MAHONEY has always been a fighter. He has fought for economic freedom, for the little man, and for American economic and political success. One of his basic beliefs is that "political liberty cannot exist without economic freedom."

In fact, from early childhood, Senator O'MAHONEY learned to be a fighter. After his father died, he studied at night, while he worked in the daytime for a publishing house. He held many odd jobs, and wrote many freelance articles. One of them was entitled "A Hundred Years Hence," and predicted television, nuclear science, and other modern-day marvels.

In 1916, Senator O'MAHONEY went to Cheyenne, Wyo., to make his permanent home there. Ever since, he has stood out as a vocal proponent of the American West. He first came to Washington as secretary to Senator John B. Kendrick, of Wyoming. Later, he served as First Assistant Postmaster General; and in 1934 he was appointed to fill the seat of Senator Kendrick, who died in office. Senator O'MAHONEY has held this seat ever since, with the exception of the years 1952-54.

Senator O'MAHONEY first served on the Judiciary Committee in 1936. When he was reelected to the Senate in 1954, he was again named to the Judiciary Committee; and since then he has played a very vigorous role on that committee and on its Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee—on both of which I have had the privilege of serving with him.

Senator O'MAHONEY has been known for his independence of thought. Although I have not always agreed with his political or his economic thinking, I have always appreciated his candor, his forthrightness, and his courage.

In the retirement of Senator O'MAHONEY, the U.S. Senate and the American people will lose a devoted servant, a fighting representative, and a constitutional scholar. As a Republican, I naturally must hope that the one who will replace him will be a member of my own party. Yet, as an American, I certainly pray that the stature of the man who will replace him in this body will be equal to that of my dear friend, Senator JOSEPH O'MAHONEY.

THE SPY BUSINESS

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the article in the Washington Post this morning by Mr. Walter Lippmann in which he discusses the present situation resulting from the flight of the U.S. U-2 airplane over the territory of Soviet Russia. As so often is the case, Mr. Lippmann hits the nail squarely on the head. He said:

Our position now seems to be that because it is so difficult to collect information inside

9390

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 12

the Soviet Union, it will henceforth be our avowed policy to fly over Soviet territory, using the territory of our allies as bases.

He goes on:

To avow that we intend to violate Soviet sovereignty is to put everybody on the spot. It makes it impossible for the Soviet Government to play down this particular incident, because now it is challenged openly in the face of the whole world. It is compelled to react because no nation can remain passive when it is the avowed policy of another nation to intrude upon its territory. The avowal of such a policy is an open invitation to the Soviet Government to take the case to the United Nations, where our best friends will be grievously embarrassed.

Mr. President, I was very unhappy and dubious about the announcement of this policy which seems to me to be insupportable throughout the world.

Mr. Lippmann goes on to say in analyzing the situation as to what should or should not have been done:

The administration should have said that it was investigating the charge and would then take suitable action. We should then have maintained a cool silence.

I have heard it suggested that certain of the committees—the Armed Services Committees—investigate this untimely effort just before the summit conference to secure some information about the Soviet Union. I think it would be just as well to let that effort wait until it can be pursued without further embarrassment to our country and to our present position overseas. However, I suggest that the Foreign Relations Committee should as quietly and as discreetly as possible, talk with our Secretary of State and see what can be done to get us out of the fix we are in. I am convinced Mr. Lippmann is right. We cannot stand on an avowed policy of violating Soviet airspace and sovereignty. World opinion, our allies, and the United Nations will repudiate that policy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article by Mr. Lippmann be made a part of the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE SPY BUSINESS

(By Walter Lippmann)

In the whirl of incidents following the capture of the spy plane the administration has ventured, perhaps the right word for it would be stumbled, into an untenable policy which is entirely unprecedented in international affairs. Our position now seems to be that because it is so difficult to collect information inside the Soviet Union, it will henceforth be our avowed policy to fly over Soviet territory, using the territory of our allies as bases.

Although the intention here is to be candid and honest and also to make the best of a piece of very bad luck, the new policy—which seems to have been improvised between Saturday and Monday—is quite unworkable.

To avow that we intend to violate Soviet sovereignty is to put everybody on the spot. It makes it impossible for the Soviet Government to play down this particular incident because now it is challenged openly in the face of the whole world. It is compelled to react because no nation can remain passive when it is the avowed policy of another nation to intrude upon its territory. The

avowal of such a policy is an open invitation to the Soviet Government to take the case to the United Nations, where our best friends will be grievously embarrassed. The avowal is also a challenge to the Soviet Union to put pressure on Pakistan, Turkey, Norway, Japan, and any other country which has usable bases. Our allies are put on the spot because they must either violate international law or disavow the United States.

Because the challenge has been made openly, it is almost impossible to deal with this particular incident by quiet diplomacy.

The reader will, I hope, have noticed that my criticism is that we have made these overflights an avowed policy. What is unprecedented about the avowal is not the spying as such but the claim that spying, when we do it, should be accepted by the world as righteous. This is an amateurish and naive view of the nature of spying.

Spying between nations is, of course, the universal practice. Everybody does it as best he can. But it is illegal in all countries, and the spy if caught is subject to the severest punishment. When the spying involves intrusion across frontiers by military aircraft, it is also against international law. Because spying is illegal, its methods are often immoral and criminal. Its methods include bribery, blackmail, perjury, forgery, murder, and suicide.

The spy business cannot be conducted without illegal, immoral, and criminal activities. But all great powers are engaged in the spy business, and as long as the world is as warlike as it has been in all recorded history there is no way of doing without spying.

All the powers know this and all have accepted the situation as one of the hard facts of life. Around this situation there has developed over many generations a code of behavior. The spying is never avowed and therefore the Government never acknowledges responsibility for its own clandestine activities. If its agent is caught, the agent is expected to kill himself. In any event, he is abandoned to the mercies of the government that he has spied upon.

The spying is never admitted. If it can be covered successfully by a lie, the lie is told.

All this is not a pretty business, and there is no way of prettifying it or transforming it into something highly moral and wonderful. The cardinal rule, which makes spying tolerable in international relations, is that it is never avowed. For that reason it is never defended, and therefore the aggrieved country makes only as much of a fuss about a particular incident as it can make or as it chooses to make.

We should have abided by that rule. When Mr. K. made his first announcement about the plane, no lies should have been told. The administration should have said that it was investigating the charge and would then take suitable action. We should then have maintained a cool silence.

This would have left us, of course, with the unpleasant fact that our spy plane had been caught. What really compounded our trouble, and was such a humiliation to us, is that before we knew how much Mr. K. knew we published the official lie about its being a weather plane. Then, finding ourselves trapped in this blatant and gratuitous lie, we have tried to extricate ourselves by rushing into the declaration of a new and unprecedented policy.

JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER, JR.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, the morning newspapers contain news of the death of Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr. I had the very great privilege of his friendship since 1942, and I regard him as one

of the greatest philanthropists and one of the most charitable and Christian gentlemen whom I have ever known. His record of philanthropic and charitable activities speaks for itself to a large extent.

In addition to the great contributions which he made to the church and to the Nation—such as the restoration at Williamsburg—he has done a great deal in private philanthropy and charitable giving which has been not only useful, but inspirational.

I have particularly in mind the occasion in 1942 when I became chairman of the national campaign organization to raise funds for the USO, which was then in its second year. We were given a goal of \$32 million to raise for the USO for service to the Armed Forces at that time, shortly after Pearl Harbor. This seemed like a staggering sum to me, but Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., felt that the task was not insurmountable, and that, on the contrary, the amount was probably not nearly so much as we ought to be trying to raise.

I recall that in those days and all through the war he was the principal inspiration to the efforts of that great organization, the United Service Organization, in which the three faiths combined, through their 6 service organizations, to render assistance and to provide a home away from home to all the men in the Armed Forces.

I recall that as we were about to start our big drive, in the spring of 1942, going to the office of our organization one morning and finding a letter addressed to me from Mr. Rockefeller. I opened it, and out of it fell a check for \$1 million. I had never seen anything like it before. I wanted to be sure that what I was seeing was actually so. Therefore I took the letter to my assistant in the next room and asked him if that is what he read too. He said, yes, Mr. Rockefeller had talked to him about it and had decided recently that that was the least he could do.

That is the kind of thing one actually never forgets. However, that was just the first million dollars he gave to help servicemen during the days of World War II.

I remember calling on him, 2 or 3 years later, at his office, possibly in the late 1940's. I went up on the elevator in Rockefeller Center to the floor on which his offices were located. I said to the attendant who met me as I got off the elevator, "I would like to see Mr. Rockefeller."

He said, "You mean Mr. Junior?"

I said, "I presume so. I should like to see Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr."

He said, "Yes; we call him 'Mr. Junior.'"

Apparently this was a man, like our Vernon Talbert here in the Senate, who had been in the service of the Rockefeller family for many years. Although Mr. John D. Rockefeller Jr., was then in his seventies, because of the earlier associations these associates of his referred to him as "Mr. Junior."

They always had a very warm affection and respect for him. That is what he inspired in other people.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

MAY 13 1960

create that impression. Frequently, it is difficult for other nations and other peoples to understand how we in the United States operate under our democratic system. An outsider can look at our land and can come to the conclusion that the West fears the East, that the South distrusts the North, that the farmers fear the politicians, that labor fears management, and that Republicans and Democrats spend their time lambasting each other hammer and tongs.

Mr. President, if our system were carried to an extreme, that would be so. If we were incapable of admitting the concept that an adversary can be acting in good faith, then we could be destroyed. But, Mr. President, I believe our system has the vitality to survive.

We are approaching an important election which could easily be the dividing line of the 20th century. In that election, all the issues will be debated fully, frankly, at length, and, I am sure, heatedly. This is as it should be, and as it must be. But in this debate, I hope and believe that we shall close our ears to the hate mongers; that we shall debate the real issues with all the maturity and all the objectivity we can muster.

When our President is at the summit conference, I want him to feel the buoyancy of a united country. The President is a member of a political party with whose concepts I do not agree. But he is still our President, and he will continue to be our President until next January. He is the one who must speak for our Nation; and practically all of us are Americans before we are partisans.

I also want to feel that our next President, regardless of his party, will be backed by the same unity of purpose when he speaks for this country. The times are much too important for anything else.

Yes, Mr. President, there is a time for partisanship; that is when we present the issues; that is when we ask the American people to decide between the parties.

But, Mr. President, there is also a time for unity. That is when the decision has been made, and when our Government must act for all the people.

We cannot, and we must not, permit our Nation to be divided either by the clever use made by Nikita Khrushchev of the U-2 plane incident or by internal hatreds of race, of creed, of religions, of color, or sections, or of personalities. When our President goes to the summit conference, he can tell Premier Khrushchev in all confidence that this land, our own America, is united. We debate issues, and we debate them heatedly. But there is one issue that is beyond debate: that is our united determination to preserve our freedoms of discussion, of religion, of the right to disagree, and of the right to live in a land that is governed by law.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the majority leader merits the commendation and the congratulations and the thanks of the country for the observations he has made with respect to the necessity for restraint at a time when the summit conference is soon to take place in Paris, and the Chief Magistrate

of this country will go there to represent our country.

When the President leaves this country tomorrow for Paris, he will go not only as President of all the people, but he will go as the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the country. It would certainly be amazing for the highest officer elected within the gift of the people to go abroad for a conference of such momentous importance and feel that the specter of doubt had to dog him as he went into that conference and into the interchanges between him and those who will be sitting around the conference table.

As the majority leader pointed out, this conference is important and momentous, because it involves the continuing peace of the world, and it involves the security and survival of our own country.

It would be amazing if a commander had to move into battle never quite sure whether he had to entertain some doubts as to whether all of them were with him at a time when great decisions had to be made.

This is, indeed, a time for unity and restraint. I saw a brief reference to an address which was made yesterday, which I shall not identify further than that, and I thought it was rather unfortunate because of some terms which were used.

I think the Congress in itself is to be congratulated on the restraint it has shown about this whole U-2 incident. We had a briefing session on Monday. It was attended by Members of both bodies of Congress, from both sides of the aisle. And when it was concluded, it was agreed that the Secretary of State should speak for everybody and make a formal statement; and, with the exception of a laudatory and commendatory statement made in another branch of the Congress, we carried out that agreement in full. I think it indicates the restraint the Congress manifests. Even though it is fair to assume that Members of Congress have access to confidential and secret data, they still showed restraint, whereas sometimes that restraint is not shown by others.

Mr. President, there is a place for this center aisle in our deliberations as we differ on domestic matters and sometimes on matters of foreign relations; but that time and that circumstance must be put aside when the Commander in Chief, when the President of the country, goes to the conference table, there to cross sabers, so to speak, on great issues. He must feel that his hand is being held up, and that we will support him, and that he speaks for a unified country.

I commend the majority leader for the statement he made this morning, because I think it will give the President great heart. I fully share and concur in those sentiments.

Mr. MANFIELD. Mr. President, I, too, on the eve of the President's departure for Paris tomorrow, to engage in a summit conference which may have momentous consequences, commend the majority leader for the statement he made earlier today, and also the minor-

THE SUMMIT CONFERENCE

Mr. JOHNSON. of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to make a few observations about an event which could determine the destiny of our country for many years to come. It is, of course, the summit conference which will take place next week.

The conference will take place against the most dramatic background in history. The world is changing before our very eyes. We must keep our heads cool and our hearts strong if we are to salvage the values which all Americans hold dear.

Mr. President, these are turbulent times. In Africa, men and women are awakening from the slumber of centuries. In Asia, the surging spirit of nationalism is sweeping away the bonds of the 19th century, in a desperate grasp by the people there for a place in the sun. In the Soviet Union, a political philosophy which openly challenges the concept that men are born free is thrusting communism into new spheres of worldwide influence. In Latin America, a restlessness grips the whole continent. In Europe, political tides are rising and falling, and men and women live on the precipice of danger and destruction.

Our President is going forth to deal with these challenging problems. At best, the situation will be very difficult to handle. But it can be complicated beyond recognition.

It can be complicated if throughout the world there is a feeling that our Nation is divided by its fears. It can be complicated if in other lands it is felt that ours is a Nation which has been split by suspicion.

Mr. President, at times there is an aspect of our political system which can

1960

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

9497

ity leader for his endorsement of that statement. As always, the majority leader has performed a distinct service in behalf of the country as a whole.

What I have to say is not presented in collaboration with what the majority leader has already said, nor, as one can observe, were the remarks by the distinguished minority leader. However, I have been thinking on this subject, and thinking of the problems which will confront the President as he represents all of us in Paris.

Mr. President, the events of the past week should bring home to all—to the Russians, to Americans, and to peoples everywhere—a realization of how slender is the reed by which we cling to a civilized survival. That is the fact and it ought now to be visible to all. Yet this fact, this blazing fact, is in danger of being lost. National passions rise up on all sides to overwhelm it. The struggle of propaganda takes precedence over it. The incident is appraised not in terms of its deep implications for the present state of the world's tensions but in terms of whose equipment is better and the present level of skills on each side for penetration, defense, and counter-penetration, and even photography.

Let me say with all the seriousness that I possess, if this game goes on in its present vein—this game of propaganda-counter-propaganda, this game of probe and counterprobe—there will indeed be a wreckage to study, a monumental wreckage. But it will be for some other generation, not this one, to study it. For the wreckage will be not just a plane. It will be the charred remnants of the civilization which houses living mankind.

That is the grim and fundamental reality which confronts the chiefs of state on the eve of the summit conference. If their attention remains fixed upon it, there will be no room at that meeting for displays of outraged indignation on anyone's part. There will be no room for propaganda-plays designed to bring to any nation the label of sole custodian of peace or the sole source of provocation to war.

At this critical juncture the four men who will meet are in every sense the principal guardians of humanity's highest hopes—perhaps of the human species itself. This may well be the decisive moment when the deadly game begins to end in the beginnings of a beginning of a durable peace, or drifts into the path of inevitable war. If they maintain that perspective these men will put aside and they will urge their peoples to put aside the dangerous provocations and the glib propaganda. They will see these provocations, this propaganda, for what they are, fragments embedded in the great wound which festers in mankind and threatens the very existence of civilization.

It is with this perspective that I hope Mr. Khrushchev will go to Paris. It is with this perspective that I feel sure Mr. Eisenhower will go to Paris.

Mr. Eisenhower will speak at the summit on behalf of all of us—Democrats and Republicans alike. That is the way under our constitutional system; there is no other. Anger, consternation, or

even revulsion at the events of the past week do not alter that fact. As the President carries our common hopes for progress toward a more durable peace so, too, should he command our common support.

There will be a time to explore the grave questions which the events of the past week have raised in this Nation. Enough has already been said to make it clear that these questions must be examined thoroughly, relentlessly. But the need now is to provide the fullest support for the President so that he may proceed with this meeting in a fashion which advances the hopes of the people of this Nation for peace.

May God go with him.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I came to the Chamber in time to hear the words of the assistant majority leader. I have read the statement of the majority leader. I wish to commend them both for joining in what I know is the feeling of all of us, that when President Eisenhower goes to Paris he will go with the united support of all of us behind him.

Over the years I have known the President I have heard him speak many, many times of his desire to get a more peaceful world. I am confident he is going to Paris to do his utmost to attain that goal and to solve some of the very difficult problems which face us today.

When the majority leader and the assistant majority leader speak for unity in our desire for the success of the President, it is mighty helpful to him, I know, and it coincides with the feeling of all of us who want and pray for a better and more peaceful world.

Mr. BROXIERE. Mr. President, I, too, should like to join my majority leader and assistant majority leader in their remarks about the coming summit conference and their hopes and prayers in which all of us, as Democratic Senators, concur, that the President may have success at the summit conference.

There have been times when I have differed with the distinguished majority leader. This certainly is not one of them. I am enthusiastically in support of his position. The majority leader has set a fine example for us, perhaps in many ways an unprecedented example. Not often under similar circumstances has the opposition party refrained from criticism.

The Democratic Party is sorely tempted, of course, in an election year, a few months before an election, to make political capital out of the tragic developments involving our plane's capture by Russia 1,300 miles inside Russia on May 1. Thanks to the leadership of the Senator from Texas, I am sure the Democrats throughout the country will recognize, as he said so well, that this is much too important an occasion for Democrats to politically exploit any partisan differences. Freedom, peace, even survival may hang on these fateful summit deliberations.

Mr. President, I also welcome the assurance of our leader that the Senate and the Congress will quietly, thoroughly and carefully investigate this situation and take whatever action Con-

gress can take to attempt to secure correction, and to assure that this country will be prepared to prevent the recurrence of the misstatements and lack of responsibility that have been so tragically revealed by this incident.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, all of us fervently hope for the success of the summit conference. Our best wishes go with President Eisenhower, as he attends the conference overseas with the head of the Soviet Union. We sincerely hope that the summit conference may lessen some of the tensions, and relieve to some degree our justified fears of further aggressive acts and belligerent action on the part of Mr. Khrushchev, the dictator of the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, nuclear war is unthinkable. The nations of the world must disarm.

Ever since early man discovered that a club could convince his neighbor more easily than a conference, mankind has been embroiled in recurrent wars of ever-increasing ferocity and destruction.

All wars have been horrible, filled with agony and death and the aching of mothers' hearts. But never before has war threatened the total annihilation of mankind.

Today, war has lost all meaning as an instrument of policy. To all who remember the horror of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, it is clear that there must never be another war.

It is a fact, Mr. President, that man has outgrown war. He has made it both impossible and impractical. The wonders of science—in this case, questionable wonders—have made it worse than folly, worse than calamity, worse than tragedy. They have made it insanity.

Mankind now controls the power to eliminate himself and to erase the great achievements of his civilization. If there is sanity left in our species, this will never happen.

Mr. President, recently the United States and the Soviet Union embarked upon disarmament negotiations. Though negotiations now are in recess, there is great hope everywhere that when they resume after the summit conference genuine progress will be made.

These talks must not fail. The art of destruction has grown too refined to permit them to fail.

In the near future, lesser nations will develop atomic and hydrogen bombs and will themselves become threats to the future peace of our world.

Before this happens, sanity must prevail over insanity.

Disarmament is the only answer to this dilemma. The leapfrog game of the arms race—where first one nation is ahead, then another—certainly cannot be the answer indefinitely.

History of the 20th century to this good hour demonstrates that armaments races between nations led to World Wars I and II. We must end the armament race with the Soviet Union and Red China by definite agreements plus safeguards; else the most terrible of all world wars is likely to be precipitated.

Mr. President, my view is that the Soviet Union now recognizes that in any war there can be no victory, for the spoils

of victory would be nothingness. My view is that the people of the Soviet Union seek peace and want disarmament and that they, as we, want to devote their energies and resources to improving the lot of their own people.

But to speak disarmament is easier than to achieve it. We must be prepared for long, tedious—often discouraging—negotiations. We must be prepared to compromise.

This has been the case with negotiations to permanently end nuclear weapons testing, and we are now near that essential goal.

Only an ostrich which has kept its head in the ground would say the negotiations, if they succeed, have not been worth it.

So it is with disarmament. Years of negotiations, if they achieve the goal, will repay us with relief, with security, with safety, and with the comforting assurance that mankind will endure and will not commit the final and irrevocable insanity of total self-destruction.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS PROGRAM

A letter from the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Federal contributions program, for the quarter ended March 31, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE VIII OF NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title VIII of the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

USE OF SURPLUS GRAIN FOR EMERGENCY USE IN FEEDING WILDLIFE

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the use of surplus grain by the States for emergency use in the feeding of resident game birds and other wildlife, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 507 OF CLASSIFICATION ACT OF 1949, RELATING TO BASIC COMPENSATION IN DOWNGRADING ACTIONS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 507 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to the preservation of basic compensation in downgrading actions (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

RESOLUTIONS OF GENERAL COURT OF MASSACHUSETTS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, which were referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, as follows:

RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ENACT LEGISLATION INCREASING THE COMPENSATION OF POSTAL EMPLOYEES

Whereas there is now pending before the Congress of the United States legislation, including H.R. 9883 and H.R. 9977, which would increase the compensation of postal employees; and

Whereas the Post Office Department requires adequate means for attracting and retaining efficient and well-qualified personnel in order to maintain the operations at a high level of service: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation that will increase the compensation of all postal employees; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress, and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth.

Adopted by the senate, April 25, 1960.

IRVING N. HAYDEN,

Clerk.

Adopted by the house of representatives in concurrence, April 27, 1960.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE,

Clerk.

Attest:

JOSEPH D. WARD,

Secretary of the Commonwealth.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

S. 3074. A bill to provide for the participation of the United States in the International Development Association (Rept. No. 1349).

By Mr. PASTORE, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, without amendment:

S. 1235. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to enter into contracts for the conduct of research in the field of meteorology and to authorize installation of Government telephones in certain private residences (Rept. No. 1348).

By Mr. DIRKSEN (for Mr. O'MAHONEY), from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H.J. Res. 602. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week in May of 1960 in which falls the third Friday of that month as National Transportation Week (Rept. No. 1350).

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 602.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 602) authorizing the President to proclaim the week in May of 1960 in which falls the third Friday of that month as National Transportation Week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 602) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session, The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Malcolm M. Willey, of Minnesota, to be a member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation;

Harry P. Anastopoulos, and sundry other candidates, for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service;

David Brand, and sundry other candidates, for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service; and

Henry H. Kyle, and sundry other candidates, for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 3543. A bill for the relief of Willia Niukkanen (also known as William Niukkanen, and William Albert Mackie); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 3544. A bill to amend the Menominee Termination Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GRUENING (for himself and Mr. BARTLETT):

S. 3545. A bill to amend section 4 of the act of January 21, 1929, 48 U.S.C. 354a (c), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. GRUENING when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. MURRAY):

S. 3546. A bill to amend the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 986); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. MANSFIELD when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia:

S. 3547. A bill relating to the recovery from liable third persons of the cost of medical care and treatment furnished by agencies and departments of the United States to persons authorized by law to receive such care and treatment; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. BYRD of Virginia when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 3548. A bill to amend the Norris-LaGuardia Act, the National Labor Relations Act, and the Railway Labor Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1960

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

9611

have been a Member of the Senate. I think we must continue the program. I deeply believe there is a need for it, and I know the Senator from Alaska feels likewise. But, on another occasion, I said there is such a thing as being so broadminded that we get flatheaded; and I am wondering if we have not reached that point on foreign aid in this country. We are so concerned about the poor and the unfortunate and the needy abroad—which we should be, and properly so, that we go to the extent of neglecting our own. That is the point the Senator from Alaska is so ably making. I am glad he is doing so, because it needs to be done.

Mr. GRUENING. As the Senator has noticed, in the last year we have been borrowing money from our own people to be able to spend abroad as the \$12 billion deficit in 1959 reveals and, under the policies of this administration, which wishes to raise interest rates, our people will have to pay still more to raise the money to give and lend to foreign nations, whereas, loans made to foreign countries are really not true loans at all, since they are repayable in soft currencies, which makes them virtually gifts, masquerading as loans.

Mr. DODD. Of course, they are. I do not want to delay the Senator further. I wish to hear what else he has to say. However, I should like to say that his complaint is not that we are carrying on a foreign aid program, but, rather, that we are not carrying it out properly, that we are not doing the job as it should be done, and that we are not taking care of our own people as they should be taken care of and, in my own judgment, as a priority matter. It is getting so that it is considered bad for an American to stand up and say that America should be given a priority in anything. In some quarters it is considered wrong to do that. It has got so that if one raises his voice so he can be heard in this Chamber, he is characterized as a demagog. We are led to believe that we must whisper; we must speak softly, in double terms and then only in certain places. It is high time that our leaders, as the Senator from Alaska is doing, speak up so they can be heard, and give the people the facts they need, so we can move ahead at home and abroad.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank my able colleague from Connecticut. I shall not delay the Senate much further, but I think when the people read in today's RECORD, what some of these foreign projects are, they will have a better understanding of the Eisenhower-Nixon's double standard. Let me refer to the list of projects.

Here is one item for \$10 million for a textile mill in the Sudan.

Here is one for \$2 million for agricultural and industrial development in Somalia.

Here is one for \$800,000 for construction of a warehouse in Nigeria.

Here is one for \$23 million for an irrigation project for the Kingdom of Morocco.

Here is one for \$5 million for an electric power plant for the Government of Libya.

Here is one for a pulp factory in Tunisia; and so on—projects which in this country our Government would denounce as socialistic and all the other adverse things that it says about any projects for the American people.

What makes these foreign aid projects sacrosanct? Yet projects costing much lesser amounts, projects which have been carefully worked out, that have passed both bodies of Congress, which are aimed at relieving distress, whether for area redevelopment, education, housing, resource development or to end water pollution, needs that exist in this country, are labeled as "unnecessary, unwise, and costly"?

Perhaps there is some allergy on the part of the Eisenhower-Nixon administration to loans repaid in American dollars and that when the loan is to be paid in new Taiwan dollars, rupees, or other soft currencies, the loan no longer is "unnecessary, unwise, and costly"?

Mr. President, I confess that I cannot understand such double talk.

But I can understand this, Mr. President: Our gross national product has now reached the sum of one-half a trillion dollars annually. What we were seeking to do in enacting S. 722 was to devote a sum approximately equivalent to what could be produced by our national effort in 4 hours to relieving the economic distress of our fellow citizens here at home in areas needing economic redevelopment.

It is my sincere opinion that the devotion of that small fraction of our gross national product to such a worthy purpose at home has at least as much merit as devoting many times that much to similar projects abroad.

The time will come—and I hope it will be not too long distant—when the Eisenhower-Nixon administration will rue the day that it forsook the interests of the people here at home in favor of the people in 104 foreign countries, and adopted its double dealing, double talking, double standard, making it the first administration in American history which by its actions shows that it prefers the interests of the people of foreign lands to the interests of the people of our own.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMUNITY ANTENNA SYSTEMS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, unless there is further business, it is the intention to adjourn the Senate shortly.

Mr. President, as I understand the situation, when the Senate adjourns this afternoon until 12 o'clock tomorrow, the pending business will be Calendar No. 950, S. 2653, to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish jurisdiction in the Federal Communications

Commission over community antenna systems.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the bill, S. 2653, which will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2653) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish jurisdiction in the Federal Communications Commission over community antenna systems.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I announce to the Senate that this measure will not be considered today, but will be taken up for consideration at the conclusion of morning business tomorrow. I believe unanimous consent has been granted that if morning business should conclude before 2 o'clock, the bill, S. 2653, will be laid before the Senate and will be open for consideration and debate by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its deliberations today it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE SUMMIT CONFERENCE

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, this is a sad day in this melancholy world. What mankind had fondly hoped might conceivably result in forward progress toward the cause of peace with honor apparently in advance has been doomed to failure.

Today in Paris the Soviet Premier has done a tragic and frightening disservice by his announcement calculated to scuttle a summit meeting which he himself originally sought.

For years the Soviets have maintained a far-flung system of espionage all around the globe. Other states, including our own, have done likewise, though none on the same scale, I believe, as Russia. We have apprehended and convicted many Soviet secret agents who were plying their trade in our own country. Now Russia in regard to the U-2 plane incident, has announced that an American reconnaissance plane pilot will be held for trial on charges of espionage behind the Iron Curtain. Meanwhile, they announce the orbiting in outer space of a mechanism which, when perfected, perhaps could supply a worldwide reconnaissance capability to them.

This morning the Soviet Premier used the U-2 incident as a basis for effectively preventing the meeting from being held. What is it, Mr. President, which the Soviets apparently, at all costs, desire to have remain secret behind their own borders? Is it progress in the fields of peaceful pursuits, or is it something else?

We deal here with the perpetuation of American liberty, and equally, with the cause of mankind's freedom. What new, or different arrangements may now be necessary, here and elsewhere, to as-

9612

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 16

sure our freedom, our Government will be prepared to make, and it will make them with the unstinting approval of all the American people and, I feel sure, with the approval of free governments and free peoples everywhere.

I have just read the text of the statement which our President made today in Paris at the conference of the heads of state. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this statement appear at this point in my comments.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Having been informed yesterday by General de Gaulle and Prime Minister Macmillan of the position which Mr. Khrushchev has taken in regard to this Conference during his calls yesterday morning on them, I gave most careful thought as to how this matter should best be handled. Having in mind the great importance of this Conference and the hopes that the peoples of all the world have reposed in this meeting, it concluded that in the circumstances it was best to see if, at today's private meeting, any possibility existed through the exercise of reason and restraint to dispose of this matter of the overflights which would have permitted the Conference to go forward.

I was under no illusion as to the probability of success of any such approach but I felt that in view of the great responsibility resting on me as President of the United States this effort should be made.

In this I received the strongest support of my colleagues, President de Gaulle and Prime Minister Macmillan. Accordingly, at this morning's private session, despite the violence and inaccuracy of Mr. Khrushchev's statement, I replied to him on the following terms:

"I had previously been informed on the sense of the statement just read by Premier Khrushchev.

"In my statement of May 11 and in the statement of Secretary Herter of May 9, the position of the United States was made clear with respect to the distasteful necessity of espionage activities in a world where nations distrust each other's intentions. We pointed that these activities had no aggressive intent but rather were to assure the safety of the United States and the free world against surprise attack by a power which boasts of its ability to devastate the United States and other countries by missiles armed with atomic warheads. As is well known, not only the United States but most other countries are constantly the targets of elaborate and persistent espionage of the Soviet Union.

"There is in the Soviet statement an evident misapprehension on one key point. It alleges that the United States has, through official statements, threatened continued overflights. The importance of this alleged threat was emphasized and repeated by Mr. Khrushchev. The United States has made no such threat. Neither I nor my Government has intended any. The actual statements go no further than to say that the United States will not shirk its responsibility to safeguard against surprise attack.

"In point of fact, these flights were suspended after the recent incident and are not to be resumed. Accordingly, this cannot be the issue.

"I have come to Paris to seek agreements with the Soviet Union which would eliminate the necessity for all forms of espionage, including overflights. I see no reason to use this incident to disrupt the conference.

"Should it prove impossible, because of the Soviet attitude, to come to grips here in Paris with this problem and the other vital issues threatening world peace, I am planning

in the near future to submit to the United Nations a proposal for the creation of a United Nations aerial surveillance to detect preparations for attack. This plan I had intended to place before this conference. This surveillance system would operate in the territories of all nations prepared to accept such inspection. For its part, the United States is prepared not only to accept the United Nations aerial surveillance, but to do everything in its power to contribute to the rapid organization and successful operation of such international surveillance.

"We of the United States are here to consider in good faith the important problems before this conference. We are prepared either to carry this point no further, nor undertake bilateral conversations between the United States and the U.S.S.R. while the main conference proceeds."

My words were seconded and supported by my Western colleagues who also urge Mr. Khrushchev to pursue the path of reason and commonsense, and to forget propaganda. Such an attitude would have permitted the conference to proceed. Mr. Khrushchev was left in no doubt by me that this ultimatum would never be acceptable to the United States.

Mr. Khrushchev brushed aside all arguments of reason, and not only insisted upon this ultimatum, but also insisted that he was going to publish his statement in full at the time of his own choosing.

It was thus made apparent that he was determined to wreck the Paris conference.

In fact, the only conclusion that can be drawn from his behavior this morning was that he came all the way from Moscow to Paris with the sole intention of sabotaging this meeting on which so much of the hopes of the world have rested.

In spite of this serious and adverse development, I have no intention whatsoever to diminish my continuing efforts to promote progress toward a peace with justice. This applies to the remainder of my stay in Paris as well as thereafter.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 17, 1960, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 16, 1960:

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

Edward C. Sweeney, of Illinois, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board for the remainder of the term expiring August 9, 1960, vice R. Lockwood Jones, resigned.

Edward C. Sweeney, of Illinois, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board for a term of 5 years expiring August 9, 1965. (Reappointment.)

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

Roy L. Stephenson, of Iowa, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of Iowa, vice Edwin R. Hicklin, retired.

INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

Arthur V. Watkins, of Utah, to be Chief Commissioner of the Indians Claims Commission, vice Edgar E. Witt, resigned.

T. Harold Scott, of Colorado, to be an Associate Commissioner of the Indian Claims Commission, vice Arthur V. Watkins.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Loren Keith Olson, of Maryland, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1962, vice John Forrest Floberg, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 16, 1960:

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Harold C. Patterson, of Virginia, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the term expiring June 5, 1965.

PUBLIC HOUSING COMMISSIONER

Bruce Savage, of Indiana, to be Public Housing Commissioner.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

Maj. Gen. Thomas A. Lane, Corps of Engineers, to be a member and president of the Mississippi River Commission, under the provisions of section 2 of an act of Congress approved June 28, 1879 (21 Stat. 37) (33 U.S.C. 642).

CALIFORNIA DEBRIS COMMISSION

Col. John A. Morrison, Corps of Engineers, to be a member of the California Debris Commission, under the provisions of section 1 of the act of Congress approved March 1, 1893 (27 Stat. 507) (33 U.S.C. 661).

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

Francis Adams Cherry, of Arkansas, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board for a term of 5 years expiring March 4, 1965.

U.S. ATTORNEYS

Ralph Kennamer, of Alabama, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of Alabama, term of 4 years.

William L. Longshore, of Alabama, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of Alabama, term of 4 years.

Joseph S. Barnhacus, of Virginia, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Virginia, term of 4 years.

U.S. MARSHAL

Oliver H. Metcalf, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. marshal for the middle district of Pennsylvania for the term of 4 years (now serving under an appointment which expired March 1, 1960).

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

Lester Clyde Carter, of Arkansas, to be a member of the Federal Farm Credit Board, Farm Credit Administration for a term expiring March 31, 1966.

Robert T. Lister, of Oregon, to be a member of the Federal Farm Credit Board, Farm Credit Administration, for a term expiring March 31, 1966.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Malcolm M. Willey, of Minnesota, to be a member of the National Science Board for the remainder of the term expiring May 10, 1964.

INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

Arthur V. Watkins, of Utah, to be Chief Commissioner of the Indian Claims Commission.

IN THE U.S. COAST GUARD

The following-named persons to be appointed to the rank indicated in the U.S. Coast Guard:

To be commanders

Richard H. Fuckett	Thomas F. Dunham,
Arthur C. Hoene, Jr.	Jr.
James W. Conway	James M. Winn
Arthur A. Atkinson,	
Jr.	



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 86th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 106

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, MAY 16, 1960

No. 49

Senate

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

God of our fathers, and our God, with this new week, our prayerful thoughts leap the sea to the summit consultations where the fate of the turbulent world may hang in the balance.

In all this meeting of minds, we would be vividly conscious of spiritual resources. We are grateful for the leaders of freemen who are there with a faith that colors their outlook, that determines their objectives, that stretches out their horizons, and which is linked to the supremacy of things unseen.

Fortified by that faith, may Thy benediction rest upon the leaders of the free world, face to face with ideas of the earth earthy, doctrines alien to the emancipating revelation which has lifted mankind from the cave to the cathedral.

At this altar of divine grace, we rejoice in the moral majesty of a creative creed whose fundamental belief is, not in material might, or in scientific achievement, but in the dignity of the individual made in the image of God and in the eternal laws of the Creator which for men and nations only are the paths to abundant life.

In spite of the formidable forces arrayed against us, grant to those who stand for us and speak for us before the bar of world opinion and judgment the triumphant assurance that they who are for us are more than those against us.

In the dear Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, May 13, 1960, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on

May 13, 1960, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 1062. An act to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to require Federal approval for mergers and consolidations of insured banks;

S. 1328. An act for the relief of Parker E. Dragoo;

S. 1408. An act for the relief of Ronald R. Dagon and Richard J. Hensel;

S. 1410. An act for the relief of Jay R. Melville and Peter E. K. Shepherd;

S. 1466. An act for the relief of Sofia W. Harris;

S. 2173. An act for the relief of Mrs. John Slingsby, Lena Slingsby, Alice B. Slingsby, and Harry Slingsby;

S. 2234. An act for the relief of the estate of Hilm Claxton;

S. 2309. An act for the relief of Gim Bong Wong;

S. 2333. An act for the relief of the heirs of Caroline Henkel, William Henkel (now deceased), and George Henkel (presently residing at Babb, Mont.), and for other purposes;

S. 2430. An act for the relief of certain employees of the General Services Administration;

S. 2507. An act to relieve Joe Keller and H. E. Piper from 1958 wheat marketing penalties and loss of soil bank benefits; and

S. 2778. An act to amend the act relating to the Commission of Fine Arts.

REPORT OF NATIONAL MONUMENT COMMISSION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am enclosing for the consideration of the Congress a report of the National Monument Commission submitted as directed by the act of August 31, 1954. I have requested the Secretary of the Interior to submit to the Congress a proposed bill embodying the Commission's recommendations.

The Commission's report recommends an approved design for the Freedom Monument, asks that the Commission be authorized to erect the monument, suggests that the number of private citizens serving on the Commission be increased

from four to eight, asks the Congress to authorize the appropriation of \$12 million as the Federal share of the cost of construction, and requests that the Commission be authorized to solicit private contributions for the remaining cost of the monument.

The act of August 31, 1954, created the National Monument Commission for the purpose of securing designs and plans for a useful monument to the Nation symbolizing to the United States and the world the ideals of our democracy as embodied in the five freedoms—speech, religion, press, assembly, and petition—sanctified by the Bill of Rights adopted by Congress in 1789 and later ratified by the States.

I believe it important that the story of the noble ideas which shaped our country's beginning, its course, its great moments, and the men who made it possible, be ever present in the minds of Americans. This purpose can be furthered in a variety of ways, but the simplest and most effective of all methods in my judgment is to present it impressively in visual form. The erection of the Freedom Monument would accomplish that objective. The National Capital area is adorned by a galaxy of memorials to individuals but nowhere in the Nation's Capital or this Nation can one find a memorial to the principles and ideals upon which our Government is based.

The Commission, since its creation, has placed the ideas I have mentioned on the drawing board. It is intimately acquainted with the problems involved in the erection of the Monument; it has advanced the memorial; and I recommend that the Commission be authorized to complete the task.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 14, 1960.

REPORT OF NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accom-

9578

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 16

panying report, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 5(a) of Public Law 307, 73d Congress, approved June 12, 1934, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the National Capital Housing Authority for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 14, 1960.

REPORT OF U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION ENTITLED "EMPLOYEE TRAINING FOR BETTER PUBLIC SERVICE" — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

To the Congress of the United States:

The Government Employees Training Act (Public Law 85-507) directs the Civil Service Commission to submit annually to the President for his approval and transmittal to the Congress a report with respect to the training of employees of the Government under the authority of the act. I am transmitting to you with this letter the Commission's report entitled "Employee Training for Better Public Service."

It is my firm conviction that training has long been essential for the successful operation of Federal agencies. Today's demands, however, bring a new urgency to training, especially for our career managers. I have, therefore, recently asked all agency heads to strengthen their programs for the selection, development, and training of these key officials. This directive is in addition to that issued in 1955 which supported all types of training.

The action of the Congress in broadening authority to train Federal employees was a healthy and progressive move. The Commission's report shows that Federal officials have made intelligent use of their authority under the act and that it has helped to meet an urgent need. I was particularly interested in the Commission's comments on "The Future," which point out two important areas needing improvement—planning, and budgeting and scheduling for training activities.

The Commission's report is encouraging and its suggestions to the agencies sound. A good beginning has been made under the authority granted by the Congress.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 14, 1960.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 3338) to remove the present \$5,000 limitation which prevents the

Secretary of the Air Force from settling certain claims arising out of the crash of a U.S. Air Force aircraft at Little Rock, Ark.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10777) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. VINSON, Mr. KILDAY, Mr. DURHAM, Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina, Mr. ARENDS, Mr. GAVIN, and Mr. VAN ZANDT were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 640) to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation in connection with the centennial of the birth of General of the Armies John J. Pershing.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (H.J. Res. 602) authorizing the President to proclaim the week in May of 1960 in which falls the third Friday of that month as National Transportation Week, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour; and I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Flood Control, Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works and the Communications Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

DEVELOPMENTS IN PARIS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, according to the news dispatches from Paris, Soviet Premier Khrushchev seems determined to destroy the summit conference even before it starts. This development has implications which must be considered with great care and calmness by all the freedom loving peoples of the world.

I doubt whether thoughtful people anticipated too much out of the summit conference under any circumstances. Nevertheless, the United States can never place itself in the position of refusing to negotiate in good faith when-

ever there is even a remote possibility of reducing world tensions and of setting the footsteps of humanity upon the road to peace.

However, several days ago it became apparent that Premier Khrushchev was in no mood for orderly negotiations. The manner in which he handled the U-2 plane incident was clearly an indication that he planned to make the summit conference either a shambles or a forum for Soviet propaganda. These indications were more than confirmed by the manner in which the Soviets have acted in the past 2 days.

Premier Khrushchev arrived in Paris with what every correspondent has described as a display of toughness.

A few hours ago he withdrew his invitation to President Eisenhower to visit the Soviet Union; and now we are informed that Mr. Khrushchev's price for negotiating at all is one that obviously is unacceptable to the United States. In other words, he is not going to discuss the issues upon which there might be some possibility of agreement, unless there are first discussed issues upon which there is no possibility of agreement.

This development is one which will disappoint the whole world. But the world has become accustomed to such disappointments.

Mr. President, this is not the first time the Soviets have deliberately broken up an international meeting, and probably it is not the last. The world would have a great deal more faith in Soviet intentions if these Communist leaders were capable of negotiating real issues, sometime, at some place, without a drum-fire propaganda campaign.

As the situation now stands, in the minds of men and women everywhere is the question of whether the Soviet Union actually wants a world of peace, or whether it prefers constant tensions which must end in disaster.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have had no opportunity to familiarize myself with the statements and the facts with respect to the summit conference which have appeared on the ticker. However, I am advised that, first, the invitation for President Eisenhower to visit the Soviet Union has been withdrawn. What the facts and circumstances are, I do not know. But it would appear to me, offhand, that this comes as something of a significant confession that evidently the Soviet leaders—meaning Mr. Khrushchev and all his associates—are quite alarmed about the effect the warm personality of the President of the United States would have on the Soviet Union and upon its people.

The second thing I glean from all this is that Mr. Khrushchev must be alarmed that a great country like the United States has penetrated Soviet security, notwithstanding all the boasts which have been made to the whole wide world and to the Soviet people. This certainly puts Mr. Khrushchev in a delicate position with respect to his own people. It is understandable, then, how irritation and an irksome attitude on his part would finally eventuate in a denunciation of the United States and a denun-

1960

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

9579

ciation of the President of the United States.

I have been informed that the President was absolutely firm in his own attitude. I applaud him for it, and I am sure the people of this country will applaud him for it, because it is the only kind of attitude the Soviet leaders can well understand, as we learn when we look into history in retrospect.

The tragedy of it all is that all this could have been understood without the necessity of the President's making a trip to Paris in the first instance. The Soviet leaders must have known, before they arrived for the conference, that this was going to be the "play," and they could just as well have uttered their intentions first, as last; and then we could have known, and on that basis could have absented ourselves from the conference, or else could have had a conference without the Soviet leaders.

A moment ago I was officially advised that very shortly the President will make a statement from Paris. I am confident it will be a firm statement from a man who is noted for his firmness in an hour of challenge and crisis.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the news from Paris is discouraging, but I would remind my colleagues and my countrymen that this is a time, not to give vent to our emotions, but to remain calm in the face of the danger which confronts us. I have said this before. I will say it again.

The events of the past week, accentuated by the reports of today's summit meeting, should bring home to all—to the Russians, to Americans, and to peoples everywhere—a realization of how slender is the reed by which we cling to a civilized survival. That is the fact, and it ought now to be visible to all. Yet this blazing fact is in danger of being lost at Paris. National passions rise up on all sides to overwhelm it. The struggle of propaganda takes precedence over it. The incident is not being appraised in terms of its deep implications for the present state of the world's tensions.

Let me say with all the seriousness that I possess that if this game goes on in its present vein—this game of propaganda and counterpropaganda, this game of probe and counterprobe, this game of charge and countercharge, this game of invite or not to invite—there will, indeed, be a monumental wreckage to study. But it will be for some other generation, not this one, to study it. For the wreckage will be not just a plane. It will be the charred remnants of the civilization which houses living mankind.

That is the grim and fundamental reality which confronts the chiefs of state. There is no room at this meeting for displays of outraged indignation on anyone's part. There is no room for propaganda plays designed to bring to any nation the label of sole custodian of peace or the sole source of provocation to war.

At this critical juncture the four men who meet are in every sense the principal guardians of humanity's highest hopes—perhaps of the human species itself. This may well be the decisive moment when the deadly game begins

to end in the beginnings of a beginning of a durable peace, or drift into the path of inevitable war. If they maintain that perspective, these men will put aside, and they will urge their peoples to put aside, the dangerous provocations and the glib propaganda. They will see these provocations, this propaganda, for what they are, fragments embedded in the great wound which festers in mankind and threatens the very existence of civilization.

I would express the hope that President Eisenhower and Mr. Khrushchev would meet privately, lay their differences on the table, talk them out, and then, along with their colleagues, Prime Minister Macmillan and President De Gaulle, recognize the danger which faces civilization—not just the United States and the U.S.S.R.—and do their utmost to bring a modicum of peace and stability to all mankind.

The hopes of mankind are wrapped up in the deliberations of these four men. Let us pray that these hopes will not be treated lightly, but with the profound gravity to which they are entitled. It is not a question of saving face; it is a question of saving civilization.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I applaud the statements of the majority leader and the minority leader and also the Senator from Montana. I believe what they have said would meet the approval and the enthusiastic backing of a large majority of the Senate, and it is fitting that these three leaders in the Senate should at this time speak out as they have so eloquently done this morning.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the feeling of resentment must be unanimous among the American people that the President has been insulted by Mr. Khrushchev. I agree with the junior Senator from Montana that it is a time when one must hold his emotions in rein. That is necessary, because the consequence of tragedy in Paris today could be grave, indeed. Unless the rift can be healed by statesmen of good will and noble purpose, one consequence—one regrettable consequence—might be an intensification of the armaments race, the easing of which the people of the world had earnestly hoped for.

I thought it was most appropriate that the Chaplain of the Senate prayed for careful, dispassionate, earnest consideration at the summit conference when the Senate convened a few moments ago.

I believe the American people can trust President Eisenhower to react as the gentleman that he is, as a military leader, as a man of honor, as an embodiment of the pride, of the hopes, and the aspirations of the American people for peace.

Mr. President, Senators will recall that I am one of those who have had misgivings about a haphazard approach to a conference among heads of state. Regrettably, the events of today demonstrate the unwisdom of substituting personalized diplomacy for the hard work and a careful step-by-step solution of international problems by painstaking negotiation through the custom-

ary courses of diplomacy. That, however, is beside the point just now. What does the future hold?

We must look to our strength. We must look to the strength of our resolution, to the strength of our dedication to the central pulse of our creation. We must look to the strength of our defense and that of the free world.

Mr. Khrushchev created the Berlin crisis. We have an agreement about Berlin. It was Mr. Khrushchev who created the current Berlin crisis, the problem, and then demanded that we settle it to his advantage. Peace is not promoted by such threats and tactics.

By "blowing up" the reconnaissance aircraft incident out of all proportion to its importance, the Russian dictator has undertaken to place the blame upon the United States for failure of the conference, while making it impossible for the conference to succeed other than through an acceptance by the Western Powers of the Khrushchev formula.

As it is reported now, Khrushchev is demanding an ignoble apology by the President of the United States of America as the price of further conferences. If true, our President will react honorably.

Events of the next decade, Mr. President, may well determine whether a free, unregimented society such as ours, through the processes of democracy and persuasion; can successfully cope with the challenge of a completely regimented society, a dictatorship which now engulfs one-third of the world and surges with the monolithic unity of totalitarianism.

To provide the answer, the United States must reassess its policies, must rededicate itself to its fundamental purpose—to the goal of greatness to which destiny beckons it.

Several Senators addressed the Chair. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the deliberate act of Khrushchev to scuttle the conference reflects once more the twisted, unreliable, tortuous line of Communist policy. I said "the deliberate act."

We saw Khrushchev get off the plane smiling. He had made some preliminary remarks before coming to the conference. Everyone thought there was to be a home coming of nations, with a big purpose of arriving somewhere. Instead of that, Khrushchev "blew his top." The arrogant way in which he made the demand for the apology of the President of this country at the opening session of the conference is in itself most reprehensible and not in accordance with reasonable conduct of international affairs. What he did causes every person who has a thinking apparatus to ask why he did it. The answer must be that he did it for home consumption. Things are not going very well within the borders of Russia.

The history of the Soviet espionage and subversion—yes, outright aggression—the world knows. Every country in Europe knows of it. Then Khrushchev puts on a stage play. I do not think he has fooled very many people by it. He has, however, created another crisis—and it is a crisis.

Khrushchev knows that today we have Colonel Abel, a Soviet spy, in a U.S. prison. He knows also that Switzerland "kicked out" a couple of spies the other day.

What does Khrushchev think? Does he think that Europe and the rest of the world are simply children in evaluating these conditions? What about these things, Mr. Khrushchev?

After long months of attempting to get an agreement for a summit conference, Khrushchev now throws the world hopes out the window and throws out the window the hoped-for agreement which might lessen world tensions. The world, I believe, will hold him accountable.

Of course, we know his motives. First, we let him come to this country. We treated him like a gentleman. By the usual trickery of Communist policies, he has now denied the equivalent right to our President, the right to meet the Russian people. Why is this? Is he fearful the salesmanship of the Chief Executive of this country is such, in relating the facts, that the Russian people might, indeed, say to Mr. Khrushchev, "We do not like your lies. We do not like the way you behave. We like the way the American Nation treats its people and the way the President of that Nation treats the people."

Of course, Khrushchev, as an international poker player, thought he had a trump card. As a matter of fact, it was only a deuce. He has already overplayed his hand.

Now we will all wait to see what the President will have to say. I am sure we will find he will call a spade a spade. He will not mince any words.

As I understand the situation, Khrushchev is proposing another adjournment of 8 months. Perhaps he hopes then there may be a new President whom he can handle.

He is going to be fooled. No candidate for the Presidency has any confidence in Khrushchev's methods or his promises. They know the history of Mr. Khrushchev and Stalin. I believe the American people should consider this food for thought when they select the next President of the United States.

Yes; these are challenging times, and it is up to all of us to realize, as has been suggested already, that we should not go off halfcocked ourselves, but think sanely. But, more than that, we should keep the Nation alert and adequate.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, Mr. Khrushchev by his action this morning, in canceling President Eisenhower's visit to Russia, has again demonstrated to the world that he has no desire to live in the world as a neighbor with neighbors.

I wish to associate myself with the remarks which have been made by the majority leader, the minority leader, and the assistant majority leader, as well as others, on the floor of the Senate, in regard to the most delicate situation that is confronting this Nation and the world today at the summit meeting. I am pleased by the calm statements and carefully selected remarks which have been made this morning on the floor of

the Senate. All who have spoken realize the seriousness of the situation.

I have a personal feeling with regard to this which I should like to state. Mr. Khrushchev, through his provocative remarks and propaganda during the last week, has let the world know that he did not dare have the President of the United States visit the Soviet Union, because of his position, because of his personal appeal, and because of his fine method of meeting folks in various countries, which has been demonstrated time and again. I regret it sincerely, because I believe it would have been a great thing for the Soviet nation—the rulers and the people of that nation—to have had an opportunity to come in contact with the President's thinking and his personality at a time when the world sorely needs that type of leadership.

I believe that on this occasion all of us should be proud of the fact that we treated Mr. Khrushchev as a ruler of a great country, and that we gave him every consideration when he was in the United States on his visit. Every courtesy was extended to him, and all doors were opened to him. Now he has demonstrated to the world that he does not care to live in a neighborly fashion with the rest of the world.

It is our duty now to remain calm and deliberate and take no hasty action, but realize that we are living in a very difficult time.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I have listened with great interest to the statements made this morning by the distinguished majority leader, the very able assistant majority leader, the gentle minority leader, and other leading Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle regarding the latest developments in Paris. Certainly I wish to commend all of them for the interest which they have expressed at this critical hour.

I am sure all of them agree with me that while this is a time for sanity and self-control, it is, as well, a time for reflection, and also a time for all of us to wake up and recognize that we have been pursuing a course which has led this Nation perilously close to grave disaster.

A few months ago, just 7 months ago, I stood in my place here on the floor of the Senate and tried my best to warn my colleagues and my countrymen of what I thought was a great blunder: to bring to the United States of America, and indeed to its capital, this very citadel of freedom itself, to this Senate Chamber, one of the greatest tyrants in world history, and give him a cloak of respectability and acceptance by the forces of justice and decency in the world.

But that is past history, sad history, tragic history. Let us learn its lesson well.

Since then, it seems to me, we have moved step by step closer to what I described a few minutes ago as a grave disaster. For, Mr. President, unless we mend our ways disaster will visit us. There are several points that ought to be made this morning. One of them is that we should never have agreed to attend a so-called summit meeting without knowing in advance what is going to

be talked about; that we should not go to such a meeting like country bumpkins.

That is what happened in 1955. I was a Member of the other body at the time, and I raised my voice then, and at that time I said I thought it was wrong to do so. But we went and accomplished nothing and suffered a setback. Some of us hoped we would learn a lesson then. But we kept right on from one mistake to another.

Now this has happened. It was all predictable, I say. I do not believe that Khrushchev ever intended to have President Eisenhower visit the Soviet Union, because he knew the President's visit would threaten his control over the people he holds in subjection under his tyranny. He knew it would threaten, as well, control over the millions of people he holds in confinement in the captive nations. He could never permit President Eisenhower, with his frankness and honesty and his captivating personality, the opportunity to talk to the Russian people who are held in thrall by the evil dictatorship of the Soviet Union.

So I repeat it was predictable. The tragedy of it is that we welcomed Khrushchev to our own country and thereby increased his prestige and standing in the world and furthered his evil plans. While this is no time for violence and no time for recklessness, it is, however, a time for reflection, for prayerful reflection.

Right now I am sure Khrushchev is carrying on a massive propaganda effort to get us to permanently suspend all nuclear testing. Many well-intentioned people are being used by him. Insofar as my limited talents are concerned I tried to make this clear here in the Senate last Thursday. There are better informed persons in Congress on this subject than I, persons with more prestige and more experience in this field. I say they should speak up and tell the people the facts and what needs to be done. Senator ANDERSON has done so, so have other Senators, but much more should be said and done by the President.

We all want peace, but we want peace with honor and peace with justice. We cannot blunder our way to peace. We cannot beg our way to peace. We cannot wish our way to peace. We must work and pray our way to peace if we want to have it.

The effort by the Soviet Union to stymie us and cripple us and paralyze us with respect to nuclear testing is another massive move by this evil force in the world to destroy us and to destroy our allies who are with us in this fight for freedom. Let them not succeed. From this hour forward let us give up all self-deception and speak and act like free men who know the truth and are not afraid.

So I hope that we will wake up.

I say to the President that he need not feel embarrassed or deeply disturbed. He can come home to the American people and to his free friends in the world. We will receive him well. His only fault is that he trusted this evil man too much, but he did so with all good intentions for our country.

1960

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

9581

It has almost become something to be ashamed of for people to talk about freedom and patriotism and liberty, and about fighting and dying for the things that are right. A man is made to feel like a fool or knave when he speaks of these things. What must we do to awaken in our people the spirit of justice and freedom? What must we do to teach them not to be frightened into peace at any price?

That is the great lesson to be learned from this calamity. Let us be strong in our faith in freedom, and brave in the face of threat and bring to our side free men everywhere. Let us recall the days of our early founding, when only a handful of people on a strip along the Atlantic Ocean gained the respect of the world because these men were not afraid to stand up and fight for freedom.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. DODD. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. I am personally very much thrilled at the sensible, courageous, and patriotic position taken by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut. Whenever in this country we are confronted by a crisis, it is, in my judgment, important that voices such as that of the Senator from Connecticut be heard to summon the country to a unified recognition of the fact that America is not only the strongest nation in the world in its armament, in its resources, and in its physical attributes, but that there exists within us a moral strength and a pride in our national history which will resist the sharp tactics of a bully and a blusterer, and which support the President in the kind of situation which has developed today.

While I shall speak further on this subject later, in my own time, at this moment I wish particularly to congratulate the Senator from Connecticut, who is never wanting in the expression of the kind of patriotic and forthright views which make so clear the attitude of most Americans. Truly this is not a time in our country for sissies or pantywaists or timid apologists, because the need and the circumstances call for unified support of our country.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Pennsylvania. He understands this situation. He can help us all to better understand.

The sorriest spectacle of all, to me, is Khrushchev, of all people, lecturing President Eisenhower on morality. Certainly a new, all-time low has been hit in the world when a man of Khrushchev's record, having the blood of millions on his hands can lecture a man like Dwight Eisenhower about morality. Perhaps this incident will help to wake up the American people. Think of a man who has never kept his word, who is full of deceit, who has caused all kinds of trouble in the world, a bloody butcher, lecturing a fine human being like President Eisenhower, who every honest man and woman in the world recognizes to be such, on the subject of morality.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED TRANSFER OF VESSEL BY NAVY DEPARTMENT TO THE AMERICAN LEGION, ELLSWORTH, MICH.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Material), reporting, pursuant to law, that the Department of the Navy proposes to transfer the vessel *Flamingo* (MSCO-11) to Jansen-Richardson Post No. 488 of the American Legion, Ellsworth, Mich.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON PROGRESS OF LIQUIDATION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE, WAR AND RECONVERSION ACTIVITIES OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the progress of the liquidation of the national defense, war and reconversion activities of Reconstruction Finance Corporation, during the quarter ended March 31, 1960; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF ACT RELATING TO FORT HALL INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECT

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to supplement and amend the act of June 30, 1948, relating to the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, and to approve an order of the Secretary of the Interior issued under the act of June 2, 1936 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON BUSINESS TRANSACTIONS BY BANKRUPTCY COURTS

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, tables of bankruptcy statistics, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959 (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the Council of the City of New York, N.Y., relating to the submission by the President of the United States of a peace formula at next summit conference between the United States and Russia; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

RESOLUTION OF KANSAS LIVESTOCK STOCK COMMISSION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, at the last session of the Kansas Legislature additional funds were voted for the expansion of the program of brucellosis eradication.

Under the new program there will be approximately 50 counties out of the 105 which have been certified, or which are in the process of being certified.

At a meeting of the Kansas Livestock Commission a resolution was adopted urging Congress, through the Department of Agriculture, Animal Disease Branch, to make available additional funds to assist the State in carrying out this program.

I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Whereas the Legislature of the State of Kansas at its 1960 finance session has made State funds available for the brucellosis eradication program in Kansas for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1960, in the sum of \$382,945, and reappropriated unused funds; and

Whereas the brucellosis eradication program in Kansas has been stepped up so that there is now approximately 50 counties out of the total of 105 which have been certified, or which are in the process of certification; and

Whereas it is the present administrative goal of the office of the livestock sanitary commissioner, working in cooperation with the Federal officials in this State to complete the brucellosis testing program in this State by the end of fiscal year 1962: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Livestock Commission of the State of Kansas, That the Congress of the United States through the Department of Agriculture, Animal Disease Branch, make available Federal funds for cooperative brucellosis eradication work in Kansas in an amount comparable to the Kansas appropriation, and in an amount adequate to meet the stepped-up program, and complete the State certification goal of 1962.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, without amendment:

S. 2581. A bill to amend the act of June 1, 1948 (62 Stat. 281), to empower the Administrator of General Services to appoint non-uniformed special policemen (Rept. No. 1351);

H.R. 7681. An act to enact the provisions of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1959 with certain amendments (Rept. No. 1353); and H.R. 9983. An act to extend for 2 years the period for which payments in lieu of taxes may be made with respect to certain real property transferred by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries to other Government departments (Rept. No. 1352).

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, with amendments:

S. 2583. A bill to authorize the head of any executive agency to reimburse owners and tenants of lands or interests in land acquired for projects or activities under his jurisdiction for their moving expenses, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1374).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 700. A bill for the relief of Mladen Carrara, Tonina Carrara, Ante Carrara, and Zvonko Carrara (Rept. No. 1356);

S. 993. A bill for the relief of Christos G. Diavatinos (Rept. No. 1357);

S. 2277. A bill for the relief of the Geo. D. Emery Co. (Rept. No. 1358);

S. 2740. A bill for the relief of Julia Sukkar (Rept. No. 1359);

S. 2942. A bill for the relief of Eugene Storme (Rept. No. 1360);

S. 3049. A bill for the relief of Oh Chun Soon (Rept. No. 1361);

H.R. 1402. An act for the relief of Leandro Pastor, Jr., and Pedro Pastor (Rept. No. 1364);

H.R. 1463. An act for the relief of Johan Karel Christoph Schlichter (Rept. No. 1365);

H.R. 1516. An act for the relief of Juan D. Quintos, Jaime Hernandez, Delfin Buenca-mino, Soledad Gomez, Nieves G. Argonza, Felicidad G. Sarayba, Carmen Vda de Gomez, Perfecta B. Quintos, and Bienvenida San Agustin (Rept. No. 1366);

H.R. 1519. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Edward Peter Callas, a minor (Rept. No. 1367);

H.R. 3253. An act for the relief of Ida Magyar (Rept. No. 1368);

H.R. 3827. An act for the relief of Jan P. Wilczynski (Rept. No. 1369);

H.R. 4763. An act for the relief of Josette A. M. Stanton (Rept. No. 1370);

H.R. 8798. An act for the relief of Romeo Gasparini (Rept. No. 1371); and

H.R. 11190. An act for the relief of Cora V. March (Rept. No. 1372).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 3032. A bill for the relief of Samuel Plsar (Rept. No. 1382).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 3130. A bill for the relief of Anne Marie Stehlin (Rept. No. 1363); and

H.R. 1542. An act for the relief of Biagio D'Agata (Rept. No. 1373).

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 3366. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, sections 871 and 3056, to provide penalties for threats against the successors to the Presidency and to authorize their protection by the Secret Service (Rept. No. 1354).

My Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 2744. A bill to extend the term of design patent No. 21,053, dated September 22, 1891, for a badge, granted to George Brown Goode and assigned to the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution (Rept. No. 1355).

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported favorably the nomination of Lyle F. Milligan, of Wisconsin, to be U.S. marshal for the eastern district of Wisconsin, for the term of 4 years.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 3549. A bill to amend the act of September 14, 1959, with respect to sales and use taxes imposed by States on sales and other business activities in interstate commerce, and authorizing studies by congressional committees of this type of taxation; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. BUSH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 3550. A bill to establish a national policy for the acquisition and disposition of patents upon inventions made chiefly through the expenditure of public funds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. O'MAHONEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SCHOEPEL:

S. 3551. A bill for the relief of Kay Addis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 3552. A bill for the relief of Arsene Kavoukdjian (Arsene Kavoukdjian); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3553. A bill to amend section 304 of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for the payment of certain American claims arising out of the war with Italy; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. ENGLE:

S. 3554. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain land to the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK (for himself, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. HARTKE, and Mr. MCGEE):

S. 3555. A bill relating to the training and utilization of the manpower resources of the Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. CLARK when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FONG (for himself and Mr. LONG of Hawaii):

S. 3556. A bill to compensate the State of Hawaii for not having been treated on the basis of equality with the other States in regard to payments made pursuant to title IV, X, and XIV of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. FONG when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for himself and Mr. ANDERSON):

S. 3557. A bill to expand and extend the saline water conversion program under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior to provide for accelerated research, development, demonstration, and application of practical means for the economical production, from sea or other saline waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

LIMITATION OF IMPOSITION OF STATE USE TAXES ON OUT-OF-STATE CONCERNS

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to limit the imposition of use taxes by States on sales and other business activities in interstate commerce, and authorizing studies by congressional committees of this type of taxation. A companion bill is being introduced in the House by Representative EMILIO Q. DABARIO, of Connecticut's First District.

Mr. President, businessmen and manufacturers in my own State of Connecticut, as well as in other States, have been alarmed by the predicament in which they have been placed by the U.S. Supreme Court decision in the Scripto, Inc., against Carson case, decided March 21, 1960. This decision would permit any State having a use-tax law to compel an out-of-State seller "at retail" to act as tax collector and file periodic tax returns, even though the only connection of the seller with the taxing State is that orders are solicited there by an independent representative who acts for other firms as well.

An equally troublesome situation has existed for some years as a result of the Supreme Court decision in the *General Trading Company* case (322 U.S. 335), which permits States to impose the same responsibilities on out-of-State sellers who send traveling salesmen to solicit business in the taxing State.

The unfortunate result of these two decisions is that manufacturers, large and small, are faced with the prospect of learning the details of the sales- and use-tax laws of every State in which they do business, collecting use taxes from their customers and filing periodic tax returns. This imposes an impossible burden, particularly on small business, and is a serious interference with interstate commerce.

A similar problem arose last year in connection with State taxation of net income derived from interstate commerce. As a result, Congress enacted Public Law 86-272, limiting such taxation and authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary of the House and the Committee on Finance of the Senate to make full studies leading to uniform standards to be observed by the States.

The bill I have introduced would amend Public Law 86-272 to include sales and use taxes within the scope of the studies to be conducted by the two committees, and to limit the imposition of use taxes by the States on activities in interstate commerce. I hope it will receive prompt consideration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3549) to amend the act of September 14, 1959, with respect to sales and use taxes imposed by States on sales and other business activities in interstate commerce, and authorizing studies by congressional committees of this type of taxation, introduced by Mr. BUSH, was received, read twice by its title, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act entitled "An Act relating to the power of the States to impose net income taxes on income derived from interstate commerce, and authorizing studies by congressional committees of matters pertaining thereto", approved September 14, 1959 (Public Law 86-272), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new titles:

"TITLE III—SALES AND USE TAX MINIMUM STANDARD

"SEC. 30. (a) No State, or political subdivision thereof, shall have power to impose, after the date of the enactment of this title, a use tax assessment upon any person with respect to sales in interstate commerce if the only business activities within such State by or on behalf of such person during the period for which such assessment is imposed were or are either, or both, of the following:

"(1) the solicitation of orders by such person, or his representatives, in such State for sales of tangible personal property, which orders are sent outside the State for approval or rejection, and, if approved, are filled by shipment or delivery from a point outside the State; and

"(2) the solicitation of orders by such person, or his representative, in such State in the name of or for the benefit of a prospective customer of such person, if orders by such customer to such person to enable such customer to fill orders resulting from such solicitation are orders described in paragraph (1).

1960

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

9649

to the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

5. It was further a part of said conspiracy that the defendant and certain of his coconspirators would use shortwave radios to receive instructions issued by said Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and to send information to the said Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

6. It was further a part of said conspiracy that the defendant and certain of his coconspirators would fashion containers from bolts, nails, coins, batteries, pencils, cuff links, earrings and the like, by hollowing out concealed chambers in such devices suitable to secrete therein microfilm, microdot and other secret messages.

7. It was further a part of said conspiracy that the said defendant and his coconspirators would communicate with each other by enclosing messages in said containers and depositing said containers in prearranged drop points in Prospect Park in Brooklyn, N.Y., in Fort Tryon Park in New York City, and at other places in the eastern district of New York and elsewhere.

8. It was further a part of said conspiracy that the said defendant and certain of his coconspirators would receive from the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and its agents, officers and employees large sums of money with which to carry on their illegal activities within the United States, some of which money would thereupon be stored for future use by burying it in the ground in certain places in the eastern district of New York and elsewhere.

9. It was further a part of said conspiracy that the defendant and certain of his coconspirators, including Reino Hayhanen, also known as "Vic," would assume, on instruction of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the identities of certain U.S. citizens, both living and deceased, and would use birth certificates and passports in the name of such U.S. citizens, and would communicate with each other and other agents, officers and employees of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics through the use of numerical and other types of secret codes, and would adopt other and further means to conceal the existence and purpose of said conspiracy.

10. It was further a part of said conspiracy that defendant and certain of his coconspirators would, in the event of war between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, set up clandestine radio transmitting and receiving posts for the purpose of continuing to furnish the said Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics with information relating to the national defense of the United States, and would engage in acts of sabotage against the United States.

In pursuance and furtherance of said conspiracy and to effect the object thereof the defendant and his coconspirators did commit, among others, in the eastern district of New York and elsewhere, the following:

Overt acts

1. In or about the year 1948 Rudolf Ivanovich Abel, also known as "Mark" and also known as Emil R. Goldfus and Martin Collins, the defendant herein, did enter the United States at an unknown point along the Canadian-United States border.

2. In or about the summer of 1952 at the headquarters of the Committee of Information (known as the KI) in Moscow, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Reino Hayhanen, also known as "Vic," a coconspirator herein, did meet with Vitali G. Pavlov, a coconspirator herein.

3. In or about the summer of 1952 at the headquarters of the Committee of Information (known as the KI) in Moscow, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Reino Hayhanen, also known as "Vic," a coconspirator

herein, did meet with Mikhail Svirin, a coconspirator herein.

4. On or about October 21, 1952, in New York City, Reino Hayhanen, also known as "Vic," a coconspirator herein, did disembark from the liner "Queen Mary."

5. In or about October 1952, Reino Hayhanen, also known as "Vic," a coconspirator herein, did go to Central Park in Manhattan, New York City, and did leave a signal in the vicinity of the restaurant known as the Tavern-on-the-Green.

6. In or about 1952, Reino Hayhanen, also known as "Vic," a coconspirator herein, did go to the vicinity of Prospect Park in Brooklyn within the eastern district of New York.

7. In or about November 1952, Reino Hayhanen, also known as "Vic," a coconspirator herein, did go to Fort Tryon Park in New York City and did leave a message.

8. In or about December 1952, Reino Hayhanen, also known as "Vic," a coconspirator herein, did meet and confer with Mikhail Svirin, a coconspirator herein, in the vicinity of Prospect Park in Brooklyn within the eastern district of New York.

9. In or about the summer of 1953, Mikhail Svirin, a coconspirator herein, did meet and confer with Reino Hayhanen, also known as "Vic," a coconspirator herein, in the vicinity of Prospect Park in Brooklyn, within the eastern district of New York, and did give to Hayhanen a package of soft film.

10. On or about December 17, 1953, the defendant Rudolf Ivanovich Abel, also known as "Mark" and also known as Emil R. Goldfus and Martin Collins, did rent a studio consisting of one room on the fifth floor of the building located at 252 Fulton Street, Brooklyn, within the eastern district of New York.

11. In or about August or September 1954, the defendant Rudolf Ivanovich Abel, also known as "Mark" and also known as Emil R. Goldfus and Martin Collins, did meet with Reino Hayhanen, also known as "Vic," a coconspirator herein, in the vicinity of the Keith's RKO Theater, Flushing, Long Island, within the eastern district of New York.

12. In or about the summer of 1954 the defendant Rudolf Ivanovich Abel, also known as "Mark" and also known as Emil R. Goldfus and Martin Collins, and Reino Hayhanen, also known as "Vic," a coconspirator herein, did go by automobile to the vicinity of New Hyde Park, Long Island, within the eastern district of New York.

13. In or about March or April 1955, the defendant Rudolf Ivanovich Abel, also known as "Mark" and also known as Emil R. Goldfus and Martin Collins, and Reino Hayhanen, also known as "Vic," a coconspirator herein, did proceed by automobile from New York City to Atlantic City, N.J.

14. In or about the spring of 1955, Reino Hayhanen, also known as "Vic," a coconspirator herein, did proceed by automobile from New York City to the vicinity of Quincy, Mass., at the direction of defendant Rudolf Ivanovich Abel, also known as "Mark" and also known as Emil R. Goldfus and Martin Collins.

15. In or about December 1954 or January 1955, Reino Hayhanen, also known as "Vic," a coconspirator herein, did proceed by rail transportation from New York to Salida, Colo., at the direction of the defendant Rudolf Ivanovich Abel, also known as "Mark" and also known as Emil Goldfus and Martin Collins.

16. In or about the spring of 1955, the defendant Rudolf Ivanovich Abel, also known as "Mark" and also known as Emil R. Goldfus and Martin Collins, and Reino Hayhanen, also known as "Vic," a coconspirator herein, did proceed from New York City to the vicinity of Poughkeepsie, N.Y., for the purpose of locating a suitable site for a shortwave radio.

17. In or about the spring of 1955, the defendant Rudolf Ivanovich Abel, also known as "Mark" and also known as Emil R. Goldfus and Martin Collins, in the vicinity of 252 Fulton Street, Brooklyn, N.Y., within the eastern district of New York, did give a shortwave radio to Reino Hayhanen, also known as "Vic," a coconspirator herein.

18. In or about 1955 the defendant Rudolf Ivanovich Abel, also known as "Mark" and also known as Emil R. Goldfus and Martin Collins, did bring a coded message to Reino Hayhanen, also known as "Vic," a coconspirator herein, and did request him to decipher said message.

19. In or about February 1957, the defendant Rudolf Ivanovich Abel, also known as "Mark," and also known as Emil R. Goldfus and Martin Collins, did meet and confer with Reino Hayhanen, also known as "Vic," a coconspirator herein, in the vicinity of Prospect Park, Brooklyn, within the eastern district of New York, and did then and there give to Hayhanen a birth certificate and \$200 in U.S. currency. (In violation of 18 U.S.C. 794(c).)

COUNT TWO

The grand jury further charges:

1. That from in or about 1948 and continuously thereafter and up to and including the date of the filing of this indictment, in the eastern district of New York, in Moscow, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; and elsewhere, Rudolf Ivanovich Abel, also known as "Mark," and also known as Martin Collins and Emil R. Goldfus, the defendant herein, unlawfully, willfully, and knowingly did conspire and agree with Reino Hayhanen, also known as "Vic"; Mikhail Svirin; Vitali G. Pavlov; and Aleksandr Mikhailovich Korotkov, coconspirators but not defendants herein, and with divers other persons to the grand jury unknown, to violate subsection (c) of section 793, title 18, United States Code, in the manner and by the means hereinafter set forth.

2. It was a part of said conspiracy that the defendant and his coconspirators would, for the purpose of obtaining information respecting the national defense of the United States of America, receive and obtain and attempt to receive and obtain documents, writings, photographs, photographic negatives, plans, maps, models, instruments, appliances, and notes, of things connected with the national defense of the United States, knowing and having reason to believe at the time of said agreement to receive and obtain said documents, writings, photographs, photographic negatives, plans, maps, models, instruments, appliances, and notes of things connected with the national defense, that said material would be obtained, taken, made, and disposed of contrary to the provisions of chapter 37, title 18, United States Code, in that they would be delivered and transmitted, directly and indirectly, to a foreign government, to wit, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and to representatives, officers, agents, and employees of the said Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the said defendant intending and having reason to believe that the said documents, writings, photographs, photographic negatives, plans, maps, models, instruments, appliances, and notes of things relating to the national defense of the United States of America, would be used to the advantage of a foreign nation, to wit, the said Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

3. It was further a part of said conspiracy that the said defendant and his coconspirators would make contact with persons to the grand jury unknown, who were resident in the United States, and at places to the grand jury unknown, and who, by reason of their employment, position or otherwise, were acquainted and familiar with and were in possession of or had access to information relating to the national defense of the United States of America.

4. It was further a part of said conspiracy that the defendant and certain of his coconspirators would activate and attempt to activate as agents within the United States certain members of the United States Armed Forces who were in a position to acquire information relating to the national defense of the United States, and would communicate, deliver and transmit, and would aid and induce each other and divers other persons to the grand jury unknown, to communicate, deliver, and transmit information relating to the national defense of the United States to the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

5. It was further a part of said conspiracy that the defendant and certain of his coconspirators would use short-wave radios to receive instructions issued by said Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and to send information to the said Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

6. It was further a part of said conspiracy that the defendant and certain of his coconspirators would fashion containers from bolts, nails, coins, batteries, pencils, cuff links, earrings, and the like, by hollowing out concealed chambers in such devices suitable to secret therein microfilm, microdot, and other secret messages.

7. It was further a part of said conspiracy that the said defendant and his coconspirators would communicate with each other by enclosing messages in said containers and depositing said containers in prearranged drop points in Prospect Park in Brooklyn, N.Y., in Fort Tryon Park in New York City, and at other places in the eastern district of New York and elsewhere.

8. It was further a part of said conspiracy that the said defendant and certain of his coconspirators would receive from the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and its agents, officers, and employees large sums of money with which to carry on their illegal activities within the United States, some of which money would thereupon be stored for future use by burying it in the ground in certain places in the eastern district of New York and elsewhere.

9. It was further a part of said conspiracy that the defendant and certain of his coconspirators, including Reino Hayhanen, also known as "Vic," would assume, on instruction of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the identities of certain U.S. citizens, both living and deceased, and would use birth certificates and passports in the name of such U.S. citizens, and would communicate with each other and other agents, officers, and employees of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics through the use of numerical and other types of secret codes, and would adopt other and further means to conceal the existence of said conspiracy.

10. It was further a part of said conspiracy that defendant and certain of his coconspirators would, in the event of war between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, set up clandestine radio transmitting and receiving posts for the purpose of continuing to furnish the said Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics with information relating to the national defense of the United States, and would engage in acts of sabotage against the United States.

Overt acts

In pursuance and furtherance of said conspiracy and to effect the object thereof, the defendant and his coconspirators did commit, among others, within the eastern district of New York and elsewhere, the overt acts as alleged and set forth under count one of this indictment, all of which overt acts are hereby realleged by the grand jury (section 793, title 18, United States Code).

COUNT THREE

The grand jury further charges:

1. That throughout the entire period from in or about 1948 and up to and including the date of the filing of this indictment, the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, through its representatives, agents, and employees, maintained within the United States and other parts of the world a system and organization for the purpose of obtaining, collecting, and receiving information and material from the United States of a military, commercial, industrial, and political nature, and in connection therewith recruited, induced, engaged, and maintained the defendants and coconspirators hereinafter named and divers other persons to the grand jury unknown as agents, representatives, and employees to obtain, collect, and receive such information and material for the said Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

2. That from in or about 1948 and continuously thereafter up to and including the date of the filing of this indictment in the eastern district of New York; in Moscow, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; and elsewhere, Rudolf Ivanovich Abel, also known as "Mark" and also known as Martin Collins and Emil R. Goldfus, the defendant herein, unlawfully, willfully, and knowingly did conspire and agree with the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and with agents, officers, and employees of the said Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, including Aleksandr Mikhailovich Korotkov, Vitail G. Pavlov, Reino Hayhanen, also known as "Vic," coconspirators but not defendants herein, and with divers other persons to the grand jury unknown, to commit an offense against the United States of America, to wit, to violate section 951, title 18, United States Code, in the manner and by the means hereinafter set forth.

3. It was a part of said conspiracy that the defendant and Reino Hayhanen, also known as "Vic," and other coconspirators to the grand jury unknown, none of whom were included among the accredited diplomatic or consular officers or attachés of the said Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or of any foreign government, would, within the United States, and without prior notification to the Secretary of State, act as agents of the said Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and would, as such agents, obtain, collect, and receive information and material of a military, industrial and political nature, and as such agents would communicate and deliver said information and material to other coconspirators for transmission to the said Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. It was also a part of the said conspiracy that coconspirators residing outside the United States would direct, aid and assist the defendant and certain coconspirators as aforesaid to act as such agents within the United States and would receive and transmit the said information and material to the said Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

4. It was further a part of the said conspiracy that the said Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and its officers, agents and employees would employ, supervise and maintain the defendant and Reino Hayhanen, also known as "Vic," within the United States as such agents of the said Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for the purpose of obtaining, collecting, receiving, transmitting and communicating information and material of a military, commercial, industrial and political nature.

5. It was further a part of the said conspiracy that the defendant and certain of his coconspirators would receive sums of

money and other valuable considerations from the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, its officers, agents and employees, in return for acting as said agents of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics within the United States for the purpose of obtaining, collecting, receiving, transmitting and communicating information, material, messages and instructions on behalf and for the use and advantage of the said Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

6. It was further a part of said conspiracy that the said defendant and his coconspirators would use false and fictitious names, coded communications, and would resort to other means to the grand jury unknown to conceal the existence and purpose of said conspiracy.

Overt acts

In pursuance and furtherance of said conspiracy and to effect the object thereof, the defendant and his coconspirators did commit, among others, within the eastern district of New York and elsewhere, the overt acts as alleged and set forth under count I of this indictment, all of which overt acts are hereby realleged by the grand jury. (In violation of sec. 371, title 18, United States Code.)

WILLIAM F. TOMPKINS,
Assistant Attorney General.
LEONARD P. MOORE,
U.S. Attorney.

THE NEEDS AT THE PARIS CONFERENCE

Mr. MANSELD, Mr. President, at this point it appears unlikely that the summit meeting will continue. The need to save face may well prevail over the need to save civilization. There is still a possibility, however, that Mr. Macmillan and President de Gaulle will be able to impress upon Mr. Khrushchev the need for these meetings to go on to the end that a greater measure of stability may be brought about in the international situation, before the little stability that is left disappears entirely.

The problem at Paris is not the U-2 incident; it is world peace. The blunders involved in that incident and—let us use the correct word in all honesty: let us call a spade a spade—the blunders in that incident and its handling are for this Nation to face. Responsibility for dealing with them rests, not with Mr. Khrushchev, but with the politically responsible President, with the politically responsible Congress, and with the American people who hold both accountable.

At the proper time, we shall trace the chain of command, or lack of it, which set in motion the U-12 flight, which has undercut the deep-seated desire of the people and policies of the United States for peace.

At the proper time, we shall find out what lies beneath the confusing zigzags of official pronouncements of the past fortnight. We shall find out why, on one day, the Congress and the people of the United States are told by the Secretary of State that, in effect, it is the policy of the United States to sanction the continuance of reconnaissance flights across the borders of another nation and why the Vice President, on a TV appearance last Sunday, confirmed this policy. We shall find out why this

1960

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

9651

happens at one time, and then, subsequently, in Paris, the President tells Mr. Khrushchev and the world that such flights had already been halted last Thursday by his order and are not to be resumed. Why these conflicting statements? Why the delay in making clear that in official policy the United States sustains international law, and that this policy is established by the President, and the President alone speaks for this Nation?

These are grave questions, for they suggest that there is not one administration, but two, not one official policy but two, with the stature and safety of the Nation and the continuance of peace torn between them.

I repeat: At the appropriate time, these questions and others will be asked. They must be asked. The people of the United States will demand that they be asked and answered, for they go to the heart of our system of responsible popular Government. They go to the heart of the question of our survival as a free Nation. But, I repeat: It is for us, not for Mr. Khrushchev, to ask and answer them.

It is for Mr. Khrushchev and the other participants at Paris to get down to negotiation, to serious negotiation, on the critical differences which divide mankind.

It is to be hoped that President de Gaulle will assume leadership in bringing about these negotiations. He stands outside the immediate crisis between the United States and the Soviet Union. As host to the conference, as a man with a profound depth of understanding of the great need for peace in an anxious Europe and a troubled world, he may yet bring a measure of sanity, a measure of reason to this conference which is otherwise destined to be stillborn.

May I say, further, that it is to be hoped that if these talks do go on, the administration will seriously consider inviting the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee to Paris to join the American delegation. We are all in this together, Democrats and Republicans. We are all bound by a common responsibility for what may transpire at this critical moment. I would respectfully suggest, in this connection, that the able and distinguished Senator from Arkansas, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. Fulbright] who is now in the Middle East, be summoned forthwith to serve in an advisory capacity to the President in Paris.

Mr. President, I recognize that responsibility for the conduct of foreign policy rests with the President of the United States. In making these remarks, I do not speak for any other Member of this body on either side of the aisle. I speak only as a Senator from Montana, responsible to the people of Montana, to the Nation, and to my own conscience.

I make these remarks with the greatest reluctance and in full realization that the hour is desperately late. I make them because I do not believe it is simply a game of renewed cold war which will ensue if this conference fails. It is more likely, in my opinion, to be the beginning of a deepening of the crisis in Germany

and elsewhere which sooner or later must bring this Nation, the Soviet Union, all peoples to the edge of catastrophe. That may be inevitable and if it is we must all face it together. But I would not be keeping faith with my State, with the Nation, and with my conscience if I did not now state my feelings as plainly and bluntly as I am able, if I did not urge the four statesmen in Paris once more to recognize, before the long night begins to close in upon us, that they are in every sense the principal guardians of humanity's highest hopes, perhaps of the human species itself and to act in accord with that sacred trust.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Although I join with the Senator from Montana in expressing our deep regret at the apparent failure of the summit conference in Paris, I would, however, be willing to leave it to history and future revelation to fix the responsibility for this failure. At some time perhaps we may get to the bottom of some of the mysteries that have surrounded the circumstances of the last 2 weeks.

I join the Senator from Montana in expressing the hope that General de Gaulle, President of France, and host to the conference, will be able to exert enough leadership to pull the Western allies back into unanimity, if there is a lack of such unanimity at the present time, and also to get the summit conference under way again, so that we may salvage some results from the great effort which has already been put into preparation for this conference.

Mr. Khrushchev has apparently made compliance with some impossible conditions a condition to the resumption of the conference in Paris. I would not expect the President of the United States to apologize to Russia for the U-2 incident unless Mr. Khrushchev is willing to apologize to the world, to every other country in the world, for maintaining the most elaborate espionage system the world has ever known.

There is a question in our minds—perhaps not so much of a question—as to whether Mr. Khrushchev ever desired the Paris conference to produce any degree of satisfactory results; but what I think we ought to make clear at the present time, and make clear to the people of Russia, the people of Western Europe, and the people of all the world, is that the people of the United States are still very earnestly desirous of making such agreements on an international scale as will lessen the danger of a terrible conflict such as could conceivably result, although I will not agree that it is imminent; and we ought to continue our efforts toward securing agreements on disarmament, as well as on other matters which relate to the relationships between the different countries of the world.

We must have world peace, and we must let the people of the world know of our desire for world peace.

There is some question now as to whether the people of Russia are fully informed by their own Government as to

what the situation is. It is believed that whatever they are told, they are given in a prejudicial manner, and one which would reflect against the people of the Western World.

I join with the Senator from Montana in expressing the opinion that we should not give up hope, and that President de Gaulle and his associates will exert every effort possible to secure a renewal of the Paris conference, or the summit conference, as it is called.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional minute, so that I may comment on what the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont has said.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as always the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken] shows the hallmarks of statesmanship and common-sense. I agree with every word he has said.

The Senator from Vermont has mentioned the resumption of the Disarmament Conference at Geneva. I should like to see it resumed, as well as the Conference on Nuclear Testing and also the Conference on Surprise Attack, which I understand is technically still in existence even though no meetings have been held, if my understanding is correct, since December of 1958.

I will say to the Senator also that if the summit meeting at Paris fails, we will all know whom to blame for the debacle, and we will know how to pinpoint it, because of events up to the present time.

I sincerely hope, in the interest of mankind as a whole, that these statesmen on whom the world depends will forget anything which might affect them personally, will think of the people all over the world, and will do what they can to bring about a degree of stabilization and, if at all possible, a modicum of peace as well.

I thank the Senator from Vermont, who has said in fewer words than I what the present situation is, what our hopes are, and what we devoutly pray will be accomplished.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I wish to place in the Record at this point a bit of information which Drew Pearson got the other day from Mr. Adenauer, when he was in Bonn. Mr. Pearson spoke to Chancellor Adenauer about the situation, and I quote from what he has said:

I asked the vigorous Chancellor of West Germany if the so-called spy incident had played into Khrushchev's hands and got the summit conference off to a bad start. He brushed it aside with, "It isn't remotely comparable to the spying Russia has been doing against the West. Russian planes fly over Germany all the time. The Communist bloc countries have 1,000 agents in Germany alone. Khrushchev has exaggerated the incident out of all proportion."

I should like to make a comment in relation to that matter. I think Chancellor Adenauer has really brought to

the summit what we might call the factual situation facts. Khrushchev never intended to have this meeting. Why? Because he needed to "shoot off" his mouth for the benefit of home consumption.

Those are not my words, but those are substantially the words of an American commentator in the Near East, who is acquainted with the conditions as they exist.

In other words, this was a diversionary tactic on the part of Mr. Khrushchev. Of course, if he can call a conference later on, when conditions at home have been smoothed over, and probably when the people in Russia who are feeling the ferment all over the world for a better standard of living have been put to sleep in one way or another, he may think it will be more opportune to hold a conference then. Then, if the conference is held, will we permit him, by his ways and means, to give us a sleeping pill?

I think the particular issue right now in America is that we be alert, be adequate, and put ourselves in a position where we will know what is going on.

In the article to which I have referred the point is brought out that Khrushchev has known what has been going on, but because the Russians happened to shoot down this young American, Khrushchev had a chance to blow up the incident and to scuttle the summit meeting.

I am not one of those who thinks war is "right around the corner," so long as we are adequate and so long as we are prepared for any emergency, of which fact Khrushchev will be made aware. He, of course, is the prime actor on the world stage. He can pull most any stunt and get the publicity he desires.

I agree with the commentators of last evening. The general consensus was that Khrushchev is not getting by with this, that the common people in the various countries recognize him for what he is.

THE SUMMIT CONFERENCE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to address myself to the same subject on which the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] just spoke, and to one or two different points.

One thing which stands out from what is occurring in Paris now with its serious impact upon the peace of the world is that Chairman Khrushchev seemingly has made a completely wrong estimate of the spirit of the American people. It has been reported that when he visited the United States he went away with the feeling that we were soft. This is a dangerous and unwarranted assumption. I do not believe it is shared by the Russian people; and if there is a public opinion in the Soviet Union, Chairman Khrushchev has by now driven matters so far that even it might assert itself.

What is important to us is that Chairman Khrushchev's bid to determine the result of our 1960 elections by outbursts or intransigence in Paris or Moscow—or by saying, in effect, he wants to negotiate with a new President—will inevitably

fail. The American people, as they have already shown, close ranks in the face of any such obvious maneuver. Not only must we close ranks at home, as has already been demonstrated in the Senate and in the House of Representatives, but we must not put all our eggs in the summit basket, which is the mistake our country could make, one which, perhaps notwithstanding the recent tragic events, we may have been saved from making. We cannot put all our eggs in the summit basket. That much is clear.

What is really the issue for us "the morning after" is the renewed effort to integrate the free world itself and to create a rule of law in the world in which the United Nations must be a prime mover. Right now we have much to be desired on both counts.

Mr. President, I join with the sentiment of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. I compliment him in expressing the hope which we all express that, everyone having had a chance to sleep over what occurred yesterday, we shall continue the negotiations in Paris, and that President de Gaulle may be the happy instrument for bringing that about. Certainly we all devoutly wish it.

We cannot in the meantime waste our lives in frustration, whatever Chairman Khrushchev's propaganda may bring, or whatever direction it may take.

So I suggest two things as well worthy of our attention. I urge upon the President right now at Paris, and thereafter, in order to utilize our time to the full: First, the integration of the free world in problems of trade, aid, immigration, refugee resettlement and travel with respect to which we face serious failures of cooperation. An example of that is the European trade conflict which was threatened, and now seems to be lessened in intensity, between the Inner Six and the Outer Seven. We have enormous difficulties right now in the growing sentiment for increased tariff protection against imports in the United States. Also there is the danger of impending meat ax cuts in the mutual security program in the Congress, and the difficulty of getting other nations to carry their share of the cost or burden of the common defense, and additional difficulties in liquidating archaic colonialist positions.

The free world needs to make a massive effort to aid less developed areas; to improve technical, professional, educational, cultural, athletic and other exchanges; to deal with extreme fluctuations in primary commodity prices, and to develop broader and more prosperous internal markets through establishing further common market and free trade areas.

The free world need not and should not exclude the Communist bloc, but it should utilize this opportunity of a probable interregnum in the effort to come to closer accord with the Communist bloc to more effectively unite its elements, and marshal its own resources for the peace struggle. Whatever may be the storm of the moment, observers believe that it will gradually subside and that something resembling competitive coexistence may develop, but this time

we hope with far fewer illusions about the desirability of a relaxation in tensions as an end in itself, and with better understanding of the fact that "competitive coexistence" means the most intensive kind of struggle on every level short of nuclear war.

The United Nations has an important role to play in this situation. It is not yet standing up to its opportunity as the agency demanding a rule of law in the world. Its diplomacy still requires "playing it safe." This is the real significance of Secretary General Dag Hammarskjöld's mild statement on boycotts and blockades of the Suez Canal by President Nasser, notwithstanding violations of international treaty commitments, international law, and President Nasser's explicit promises of 1956 made directly to the United Nations itself.

Mr. President, the Secretary General is doing the best he can, and his attitude is very understandable. His attitude is the natural result of a fear that the necessary two-thirds of the nations will not back a strong moral and legal position, and therefore of thinking of the United Nations more as a trade association to be held together at any cost than as an agency to secure justice in world affairs.

The real difficulty appears to be that Chairman Khrushchev and his associates have the idea that they are about to leapfrog the whole world in terms of basic productive strength and capability. The free world needs to make a bound forward to restore the perspective of the Soviet leaders. This can most effectively be done by major means to unite the free world and integrate its resources, and by strengthening the machinery for undertaking the rule of law in the United Nations. It is for this reason that President Eisenhower's proposal for aerial surveillance will become so important. Let us utilize our time now to advantage, not in useless recriminations of the what-might-have-been.

Mr. President, I address this request to our President. Let him in Paris now—even if Mr. Khrushchev will not participate—continue the summit conference for the purpose of uniting and strengthening the free world. This will in the ultimate prove to be far more potent than endeavoring to continue negotiations with a man who refuses to negotiate for whatever reasons he may have. This means no derogation of our love for peace and no derogation of our respect for the Russian people. It means only that we move to strengthen the free world at a time when its strength will determine whether or not there shall really be peaceful coexistence, or whether the Communists will so completely overestimate their own situation as to bring us to the brink of some holocaust. Chairman Khrushchev shows that negotiations with the Communist bloc are likely to prove fruitful only when we have proved the economic superiority of our system. In the meantime we should talk and negotiate at every opportunity but without illusions.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the very fine

1960

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

9653

remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and others with regard to the episode which the world witnessed yesterday, and commend them for the views they expressed.

Certainly, for all-around arrogance, it would be extremely difficult to outdo yesterday's performance by the world's highest ranking blusterer, Mr. Khrushchev. It was not enough that he had already received assurance that American reconnaissance flights over the Soviet Union had been suspended since the U-2 incident and would not be resumed, but he wanted more. He wanted a public humiliation of the President of the United States. He wanted apologies, punishments, and guarantees as his price for remaining in Paris, and as an added insult, he withdrew his invitation to President Eisenhower to visit the Soviet Union.

The height of his insult was reached in his effort to interfere with the electoral processes in the United States, in the statement that a new administration might have a different method of dealing with him. Then he threw into it, for good measure, some very insulting remarks about the President of the United States.

I do not believe that Mr. Khrushchev will be successful in influencing the people of this country with respect to their selection of candidates for high office. I rather anticipate also that Mr. Khrushchev will learn before he is through that the people of this country are very well united in their method of dealing with him. Certainly this effort on his part to interfere with our electoral process was a gratuitous insult of the first order.

He had the consummate gall to demand American punishment for all those concerned with the U-2 flight. He failed to tell us what punishment, if any, has been meted out by the Soviet Union to the spies, both Russian and American, who have left this country and disappeared behind the Iron Curtain in Russia, some of them now holding high positions in that country. I know of no case in which anyone has been punished in Russia for his acts in spying on our country.

I suppose Khrushchev expects Congress to impeach the President of the United States and sentence Allen Dulles to 20 years at hard labor. In that connection, Mr. Khrushchev had better think twice.

Millions and millions of people in this country and all over the world prayed that the summit conference would resolve issues or, at least, take an important step in that direction. It is still the hope of many, including myself, that the summit talks will continue, although certainly a heavy cloud has been cast over that hope.

What can possibly be the motives of a man who deliberately seeks to wreck the conference on its very first day? Clearly this is not something that was thought out on the moment. It was preconceived in Moscow. The reaction of thinking people in the free world can

only be one of utter disgust. It is obvious that Mr. Khrushchev wants the cold war to continue. The world now knows that his pious pleas for peace were as phony as an aluminum half dollar.

As for his crude withdrawal of his invitation to the President, this is one of the rare cases in history when inhospitality has been used as a weapon. Khrushchev apparently is disposed to feel that he cannot run the risk, not of hostile demonstrations, as he has indicated, but friendly demonstrations toward our President by the Russian people. In the light of President Eisenhower's triumphal visits to India and Pakistan and South America, this is perhaps understandable.

The militarily realistic Soviet people cannot be sold the idea that spying is the act of the Devil, as Khrushchev has put it, because spying is an accepted policy of the Soviet Government. Fundamentally this is not a positive move on Khrushchev's part; it is a negative move, and a move of retreat. The thin armor plate of moral indignation he has assumed does not become this man whose past does not bear complete unveiling. While his colonies of spies range all over the world and not only go unpunished, but are honored, we are asked to make a public show of penitence because one of our intelligence agents was apprehended by the Soviets.

Mr. President, the world knows that President Eisenhower is a truly dedicated man of peace, more dedicated to the maintenance and preservation and furtherance of peace in this world than any other individual, and that he has done as much as he honorably can do to hold the summit together. If the summit disintegrates, the responsibility will rest squarely upon Nikita Khrushchev.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the distinguished Senator from New York for yielding to me. Does not the Senator agree with me that Mr. Khrushchev is fighting a certain intangible which he cannot beat, and which he can never hope to beat? I refer to the fact that he has indicated he does not want President Eisenhower to appear in Russia. A statement given out by his aides strongly indicates that his purpose is to take a chance on the next election, and thereby hope that under those circumstances a future President might come to Russia under conditions which he thinks would be more favorable to him; whereas the next President of the United States, no matter who he is, will go not only as President, if he goes to Russia, but also as the symbol of something that Mr. Khrushchev cannot lick, and that is the symbol of freedom. If he goes, he will be cheered. If he goes, the hearts of the Russian people will go out to him, as the people of the satellite countries gave their hearts to the leaders of America, and as the peoples of the world gave their hearts to Eisenhower. They stand and cheer and they stand and weep, because they see before them the symbol of the free peoples of the earth.

Does not the Senator agree with me that what Mr. Khrushchev is hoping for is that someone will get him off the hook, from which he cannot extricate himself because he is the head of a slave system?

Mr. KEATING. What the Senator says is true. Khrushchev will be fooled. In the first place, the most insulting move I have ever heard of is the attempt to tell the American people whom they should name or what party they should name to control the destinies of this country.

Secondly, I do not believe it will be of any effect in this country, because our Nation stands united, no matter who our President is. If the President ever went to Russia, he would go with the backing of the American people. Certainly we do not propose to let Mr. Khrushchev be successful in indicating who he thinks that President should be.

He may not like the present administration, and may not, as he has indicated very clearly, like the President or the Vice President personally. However, he will find, I anticipate, that whoever is the President, he will stand four-square for the things we believe in.

Mr. SCOTT. Exactly. My point is that whether the President is a Democrat or a Republican, Mr. Khrushchev has nothing to hope for in that direction, if he seeks to divide us or to smother the symbol of freedom and equality and courageous defense of those fundamental principles which our next President, whoever he may be, will surely exemplify.

Mr. KEATING. I am sure that is so. I appreciate the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 1961, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE (S. DOC. NO. 97)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed amendments to the budget for the fiscal year 1961, involving an increase in the amount of \$20,138,000, for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which, with an accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Finance:

"CONCURRENT RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS TO ENACT LEGISLATION PROVIDING HOSPITAL, SURGICAL, AND NURSING HOME BENEFITS TO OLD-AGE SURVIVORS INSURANCE RECIPIENTS

"Whereas 500,000 New Jersey men and women, having passed the age of 65, require more than 2½ times as much hospitalization as the general population; and

9654

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 17

"Whereas more than half of the aged population have incomes of less than \$1,000 per year; and

"Whereas access to the highest quality health care should be the right of the elderly under circumstances which promote self-respect and encourage independence; be it

"Resolved by the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey (the Senate concurring):

"1. The Congress of the United States is memorialized to enact amendments to the Social Security Act so that old-age and survivors insurance recipients will receive hospital, surgical, and nursing home benefits as a benefit right;

"2. An authenticated copy of this resolution be forwarded to the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives;

"3. Copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States and to the Members of Congress elected from New Jersey.

"MAURICE A. BRADY,

"Speaker of the General Assembly.

"Attest:

"MAURICE F. KARP,

"Clerk of the General Assembly.

"GEORGE HARPER,

"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"HENRY A. PATTERSON,

"Secretary of the Senate."

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA LEGISLATURE

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], I send to the desk a concurrent resolution of the General Assembly of South Carolina memorializing the Congress to request the U.S. Treasury Department to mint a sufficient number of half dollars commemorating Old Ninety Six Star Fort.

I ask that this concurrent resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION TO MEMORIALIZE CONGRESS TO REQUEST THE U.S. TREASURY DEPARTMENT TO MINT A SUFFICIENT NUMBER OF HALF DOLLARS COMMEMORATING OLD NINETY SIX STAR FORT

Whereas the general assembly is cognizant of the historical importance of Old Ninety Six as an Indian trading post on the Cherokee Path in the 17th century, the farthest English settlement from the coast, the site of a fort for the protection of settlers in the Cherokee War, and the seat of justice for huge Ninety Six District, comprising the later districts of Abbeville, Edgefield, Newberry, Laurens, Spartanburg, and Union; and

Whereas in the American Revolution, renown was added to Ninety Six as the scene of two outstanding military events, and the village was also a focal point of violent patriot-Tory strife which rent the up country with bitterness, destruction, and sorrow through the war years; and

Whereas the general assembly believes that historical sites in South Carolina should be preserved reverently as evidence of our way of life in the past, and should be passed on to posterity with a distinct feeling of pride in the great advancement and achievements of our State; and

Whereas the general assembly desires that an investigation be made with a view to restoring the town and Star Fort and such other historical ruins as may be practical to

something of their former likenesses and preserving them as historical shrines by erecting suitable markers thereon and by providing for adequate protection to insure their preservation for the future; and

Whereas the general assembly believes that such investigation should include a conference with the present owners of the site with a view toward the acquisition and restoration of the fort; and

Whereas funds may be raised from the sale of a commemorative issue of half dollars, all of which issue would be purchased from the U.S. Government by the Greenwood County Historical Society as a means of financing such acquisition and restoration: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That Congress be memorialized to request the U.S. Treasury Department to have minted a sufficient number of half dollars commemorating Old Ninety Six Star Fort and that the special issue be sold to the Greenwood County Historical Society to be used for the purpose of acquisition and restoration of Old Ninety Six Star Fort; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the clerk of the U.S. Senate, the Clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives, and to each member of the South Carolina congressional delegation.

RESOLUTION OF RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE OF CITY COURT OF BUFFALO, N.Y.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the resolutions committee of the city court of the city of Buffalo, N.Y.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE OF THE CITY COURT OF BUFFALO, N.Y.

At the annual observance commemorating the adoption of the Polish Constitution of the 3d of May, held at Dom Polski Hall, 1081 Broadway, in the city of Buffalo, N.Y., on May 8, 1960, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"Whereas the year 1960 marks the 169th anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791, which documented for all time the respect of the Polish people for the dignity of the individual and their lofty aspirations for freedom; and

"Whereas today the desire of all people, regardless of color or national origin, the world over, is to breathe the air of freedom and to possess the right to decide for themselves a government of their liking which shall conduct their internal affairs; and

"Whereas a summit meeting is scheduled between our President Dwight D. Eisenhower and Premier Nikita Khrushchev, commencing May 16, 1960, and which will be attended by the leaders of the Western Powers; and

"Whereas we feel that a lack of a positive and affirmative position on the part of our American State Department and support for the retention of Poland's western boundaries at the Oder and Niese Rivers places the people of Poland in the position of reliance upon the Soviet bloc as the sole guarantor of its western boundaries: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That as Americans dedicated to the cause of freedom for all nations, we feel dutybound in the name of international justice and morality to appeal to our State Department to be firm in the forthcoming summit meeting of world powers in order to preserve world peace; and be it further

"Resolved, That we appeal to the State Department for a declaration that the U.S. Government is in favor of retention of Poland's boundaries at the Oder and Niese Rivers; and be it further

"Resolved, That we commend our great President Dwight D. Eisenhower on his actions, personally undertaken by him, to resolve many of the crises that have arisen on the international forum, for his dedication to the cause of a just world peace, for his efforts to create good will for the United States throughout the world; and be it further

"Resolved, That we Americans who are of Polish ancestry, assembled at this observance, pledge our allegiance and our loyalty to our great and beloved country, and that we voice these appeals in regard to the land of our forefathers, Poland, as good Americans, reflecting the opinion of our fellow Americans who believe in the dignity of man; that Poland, historically our ally at all times of our country's need, should be afforded better treatment in view of the great sacrifice made by her people; and be it finally

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to our President Dwight D. Eisenhower, Secretary of State Christian A. Herter, our New York State Senators, Hon. Jacob Javits and Hon. Kenneth Keating, and our Representative in Congress, Hon. Thaddeus Dulski."

MICHAEL E. ZIMMER,

JOHN F. WOWOH,

WALTER J. LOHR,

ROSE BIEDRON,

DR. BOLLDAN F. POWLOWICZ.

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION, YONKERS, N.Y.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I want to call attention this morning to a resolution of the board of education of Yonkers, N.Y., concerning the excise tax on general telephone service. The resolution provides for the levying of this tax at the State level for educational purposes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas on April 8, 1960, Governor Rockefeller signed into law chapter 418 of the Laws of 1960; and

Whereas this chapter authorizes the imposition of a tax for school purposes on general telephone services on a countywide basis; and

Whereas additional funds are urgently needed by the board of education of the city of Yonkers to provide more adequately for the educational program in the public schools; and

Whereas the city of Yonkers is presently within \$10,326.14 of its constitutional tax limit of 2 percent, and is thereby restricted in providing additional funds for the educational program; and

Whereas the board of education of the city of Yonkers, in order to serve more adequately the educational needs of the more than 25,300 pupils enrolled in the Yonkers public schools, wishes to utilize the revenues from this source beginning September 1, 1960, in the event that the Federal Government does not reimpose this tax: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of education of the city of Yonkers, pursuant to chapter 418 of the Laws of 1960, hereby requests the imposition of a local tax for school purposes

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

9667

place the land at another point and also replace the building which had been on the ceded land.

The services not only refuse to yield real estate but persistently try to do more with what they have. The Army recently proposed reactivating its nearly idle Cleveland and Lima, Ohio, ordnance plants and its Detroit arsenal. The Cleveland plant was to be used to produce lightweight combat vehicles, and the Detroit and Lima plants to produce medium-weight combat vehicles—all satisfactorily produced by private firms. The Army argued its plants could produce the vehicles more cheaply and better. Top Pentagon officials vetoed this plan as too sweeping, but expect the Army to come back shortly with a more modest proposal.

When the services do get ready to dispose of installations, they frequently run into stormy opposition. Local merchants like the military payrolls. Southern Wisconsin took months to quiet down not long ago when the Air Force decided to discontinue construction of the new Bong Airbase and dispose of the land. Right now Maryland and Virginia Congressmen of both parties are teaming up again, as in past years, to pressure the Navy into revising plans to cut back Washington's naval weapons plant with its 5,600 employees. The plant makes a variety of missile control devices, antisub gear and other items which management specialists agree could be better produced elsewhere.

PROBLEM OF DUPLICATION

Elimination of military duplication is considered another huge area of potential savings, and here too there is marked resistance to change within each service. Each has its own medical, communications, supply, contracting, auditing, and weather forecasting systems—and each aims to keep them as long as it can.

A congressional staff study recently estimated Armed Forces medical costs at over \$400 million a year, with some 185 hospitals in the United States and 90 overseas. The hospitals have a total capacity of about 105,000 beds and average occupancy of less than 40 percent. They employ about 145,000 people, about 75 percent military and 25 percent civilian.

"It is difficult to conceive," the report said, "of an area that would more readily lend itself to consolidation than medical care. The conditions which require medical service, the facilities for treatment, and the professional standards for medical personnel are virtually indistinguishable among the services."

At Denver, a 350-bed hospital at Lowry Air Force Base keeps only 100 beds in use to care for an average load of 51 patients. Six miles away, Fitzsimons Army Hospital, with 2,078 beds, operates about 900 of them to care for an average of 684 patients.

At Langley Air Force Base in Virginia, a 217-bed hospital keeps 100 beds in use to care for 62 patients, on the average. Six miles away, at the Army's Fort Monroe, there is a 141-bed hospital, in which 35 beds are maintained to care for an average 20-patient load.

DEPOTS DO SAME JOB

Supply distribution is an area of rampant duplication, experts say. In the Southeastern United States, one congressional investigation has found, the Army's Atlanta and Memphis depots, the Air Force's mobile depot, the Marine Corps supply center in Albany, Ga., and four Navy stock points are all supplying their respective services with the same supplies. Army supply operates through seven different technical services—Ordnance, Chemical, and the like—each with specific types of material assigned it. This results in no less than 24 separate Army supply control points in the continental United States—several for each of the 7 services—when 5 to 8 could handle the job nicely, according to one management expert.

Military overbuying, lack of standardization, bad inventorying, and slow and costly surplus disposal habits long have been favorite congressional targets. Some progress has been made, budget scanners say, but much remains to be done.

This year the Navy has begun buying extra plane engines on the basis of having a 150-day supply in the pipeline; previously, it insisted on a 210-day supply. Though the shorter cycle would save millions, it took the General Accounting Office, Congress' spending guardian, two long battles to get the Navy to change.

Attempts to standardize military footwear have so far eliminated 752 different types and finishes, but 339 types remain. Pentagon experts recently attempted to prescribe a black low men's shoe as standard for all services. The Marine Corps insisted on keeping its mahogany shoe because it matched the bill on the Marine caps, and the Navy insisted on keeping a brown shoe for its fliers because it has been traditional—ever since late in World War II.

MANY ITEMS DIFFER ONLY SLIGHTLY

Over 1.3 million common supply items, according to congressional investigators, differ among the services in such relatively minor respects as color, finish, or even just names. Defense officials estimate they could save about \$1 million a year in management expenses alone—not counting procurement savings from placing larger consolidated orders—for every 1,000 items eliminated from the supply system.

The Defense Department has been ballyhooing its single manager system as the answer to many of its buying problems. Under this system, one service buys all supplies of one kind for all the services; the Navy does all the fuel purchasing, for instance. But management experts say it's only a step in the right direction.

For one thing, the Pentagon is installing the system very slowly; seven supply categories were put under single managers in 1955 and 1956, but only two more minor categories have been added since then. More important, though, the single manager has authority only to consolidate and place the orders he's given. He has no power to standardize equipment, redistribute excess stocks, or cut back orders.

"If we can extend its use, and raise it to a higher level of command where it can really accomplish more, the single manager system might some day pave the way for a separate single supply service," one would-be reformer wistfully asserts.

FRINGE BENEFITS

Perhaps one of the touchiest areas of theoretical saving in the entire military establishment is the vast number of "fringe" benefits which military personnel now enjoy. Many have grown out of all proportion to the original intent, and now seem beyond uprooting.

Commissaries are a prime example. These food supermarkets were supposed to be set up where there were no private facilities selling at reasonable prices convenient to the post. Now there are over 250 commissaries in the continental United States, many in cities such as Washington and New York.

The right to buy there is now extended not only to people living on the posts, but to military families off the post, reserve and retired personnel, and Public Health officials. Less than 20 percent of the people holding permits to buy at U.S. commissaries now live on the base where the store is located. In Washington, customers at the Walter Reed Army Hospital commissary include such off-base types as a National Institutes of Health neurologist and a World War II Navy nurse, now a reservist, who is the mother of seven children and extremely unlikely ever to return to active duty.

The Government not only employs 9,000 people to man the commissaries, but supplies the buildings, equipment, light, heat and other services. The customers pay only the original cost of the food, plus transportation charges, and a highly inadequate 3 percent markup to cover all else. Military experts figure the annual running subsidy is \$75 million, not counting depreciation on the buildings and equipment.

The Government also provides medical care and hospitalization for military men and their dependents, including veterinary care for pets; a retirement plan completely Government-financed; quarters, often including all or much of the furniture; in many areas, free libraries and even bus service to public schools; in many cases, subsidized laundry service; free personal travel on military planes and ships if space is available; and burial in Government-owned cemeteries, including plots for pets.

"The military life," comments one administration official, "is marked by growing socialism and paternalism, literally from the cradle to the grave."

Mr. GRUENING. It is difficult to understand the performance of this administration. Two years ago, it insisted that the strategic and military importance of Alaska was so great that virtually the northern half of Alaska—the entire area north of the Yukon and Porcupine Rivers, and some to the south of it, including most of the Alaska Peninsula and the 900 miles of Aleutian Islands—had to be set aside as an area which could be withdrawn wholly or in part for defense purposes. This is an area of over 225,000 square miles, an area larger than California, and almost as large as California and Oregon combined.

I have here in the Chamber a map which I borrowed from the office of my able colleague [Mr. BARTLETT], which shows the Eisenhower line dividing Alaska practically in half. All that area above the red line is the area which the President insisted must be withdrawn for defense purposes, and that unless such a provision were included in the statehood bill he could not approve the bill. I call the attention of my colleagues to the tremendous extent of that area.

Alaskans, and the Alaska delegation, saw no justification for this proposal, but were told officially that this would be a prerequisite to getting Presidential approval of the Alaska statehood bill. So we agreed, and section 10 and subsections A, B, C, D, and E thereof of the statehood act provided for the drawing of a so-called Eisenhower line, ostensibly in the interest of national security, in this strategic area. There has been nothing like it in previous American history. The constitutionality of this provision was challenged during the Senate debate on the statehood bill. But these objections were overborne by the assumption that such a huge potential excision from the 49th State was deemed indispensable for the future security of our Nation by the Commander in Chief. Now, in effect, the offensive and defensive strength of northern Alaska is to be largely withdrawn.

How can these two contradictory actions of the Eisenhower administration be reconciled? Let us not delude ourselves that Alaska is now adequately defended. It is not. It can become an-

other Pearl Harbor. A few months ago, our excellent theater commander in chief of the Alaskan command, Lt. Gen. Frank Armstrong, called attention to the total lack of missile bases in Alaska. He felt so strongly on the subject that he expressed this view publicly. But his warning and plea were ignored by the administration. The Pentagon informed us the other day that he was not even consulted about this latest proposed slash in Alaska's fighter strength.

Mr. President, since the discovery by the Russians of our observation plane on its espionage mission, and the announcement by the administration that we intend to continue to send planes into Russia on spying missions—a statement made by the Vice President over the weekend, but later countermanded by the President—there is no reason to assume that the Russians will not do likewise. As a matter of realism the administration might reverse its stand again. Why should they not if they can get away with it? And why should they not add this form of spying to the other forms they practice, since the United States has done it and proposes to continue to do it? However, when Russian planes come into northern Alaska on spying missions, the fighter strength to bring them down will have been abolished. Nor are there any missile installations there to protect us against such espionage from the air or the offensive sorties which may follow.

Twenty-five years ago a great and courageous Army officer, a pioneer flyer, the late William "Billy" Mitchell, testified before a House Committee on Military Affairs:

Alaska is the most central place in the world for aircraft and that is true either of Europe, Asia, or North America. I believe in the future he who holds Alaska will hold the world, and I think it is the most important strategic place in the world.

Billy Mitchell's great wisdom about the importance of aircraft in war was scorned at the time by the high military commands of both the Army and Navy. Indeed Billy Mitchell, for his vision, for his courage, and his unflinching determination to safeguard the military strength of our country, was crucified on what we might call a cross of brass. He was, in fact, cashiered and driven out of the Army. But after his death, his vision about the importance of the air-plane as an instrument of combat came to be appreciated. The high command of that day was proved wrong. It was wrong, however, at a time when the consequences of its shortsightedness and its wrongness were not as they are and could be now. We did not then face a ruthless, determined, and unprecedentedly powerful totalitarian enemy which makes no secret of its purpose to conquer the free world and to substitute its Communist way of life for ours. Our relations with Russia, which have never justified the slightest letdown of our guard, are moreover further strained by the recent U-2 episode and what has since developed in Paris.

Nor was Billy Mitchell's wisdom about the strategic value of Alaska appreciated, despite the pleas of Alaskans, notably those of our late Delegate in

the House, Anthony J. Dimond, and, consequently, Alaska's defenselessness caused it to be the only area in North America during World War II that was invaded and for a time held in part by the enemy. There was some subsequent improvement thereafter in Alaska's defenses, notably because of Alaskans' protests, including the protests of our succeeding delegate in the Congress, my present colleague [Mr. BARTLETT], but for a long time the inadequacy of Alaskan defenses continued, and they have never been adequate. As General "Hap" Arnold wrote in his book, "Global Mission:—"

Through to this day, Alaska has never received the attention in national defense planning that it deserves.

And further:

Alaska had always been and no matter what happened in any theater of war, always remained, to me privately, a high priority. But we were never able to get the money or allocations for the air force that we really needed there to give us the kind of bases we required then—and need more than ever now.

Those words, although written 11 years ago, are certainly no less and possibly more true today.

Mr. President, there was, as I have said, for a time an improvement in the defenses of Alaska, but they have never been sufficient. At the same time, we have been spending billions of dollars on bases all over the world. Many of these are, figuratively speaking, built on quicksand. Some of them we hold at the dubious pleasure of dictators. And even in the free world, our tenure of some bases, which have cost billions of dollars, is most uncertain. I do not wish to embarrass the administration by citing these examples specifically, as I could, or going into detail about some of the stratagems and the expenditures—if we can use that polite euphemism—which have had to be employed to persuade other governments to permit us to keep our bases within their borders. By contrast what we build in Alaska, on American soil, is not built on political quicksand, not amid peoples of doubtful sympathy with our cause, not in areas subject to the dangers of subversion and sabotage, not in countries whose tolerance of our presence must be ever reconfirmed and rebought, but instead is built on the solid rock of American terrain, amid an American population militantly loyal, patriotic, and alert. So we have just another example of this Administration's double standard, which I have pointed out repeatedly in other aspects of the so-called mutual security program. While we spend lavishly abroad on establishments of dubious validity and permanence, we are jeopardizing security within our own borders, to the detriment of our safety and of our economy, by a budgetary policy that is the height of folly.

To return to the latest blow at our actual defensive strength in Alaska, there are some strange contradictions and anomalies in the Air Force's action.

Testifying before the Subcommittee on Military Construction of the Senate Armed Services Committee as recently as

April 13 last, less than 1 month after which we were told of the liquidation of the entire fighter force at Ladd Air Force Base, Under Secretary Charyk testified that subsequent to the Air Force submission of its fiscal 1961 construction program, major changes in the previously programed air defense system were approved, and he named three necessary revisions. They were, first, a more timely completion of an improved defense against air-breathing enemy weapons; second, an acceleration of systems designed to provide ballistic missile warning; and, third—and kindly note this, Mr. President—an improved deterrent posture.

Just how is our deterrent posture, which Under Secretary Charyk says is one of the Air Force's objectives, improved by the elimination of the entire fighter force north of the Alaska Range, and nearly 50 percent of our total fighter force in Alaska—for at Elmendorf Field, 300 miles to the south, is the balance of our Alaska fighter force consisting of 33 fighters?

And even more amazing—in view of the Air Force's proposed action—is the statement, a few sentences later, by Under Secretary Charyk, to be found on page 319 of the printed hearings:

To complete the picture, we also plan a revised and improved fighter-interceptor force.

Just how is the total elimination of our fighter force at our northernmost air-base and nearly half of Alaska's present total fighter force, a revised and improved fighter-interceptor force?

Either Under Secretary Charyk had adopted "Newspeak," in which words mean the opposite of what they say, or a fundamental change in Air Force program and policy had again occurred in the less than 30 days between Under Secretary Charyk's appearance before the committee and our delegation's visit to the Pentagon on May 10. The Nation is entitled to an explanation of a defense policy that is so radically changed within a few weeks that it is changed once after the submission of the 1961 construction authorization program and changed again after that program is testified to before the Senate committee.

Moreover, later that same day, April 13, just a little over a month ago, Colonel Parkhill, presented by General Curtin as the Air Force spokesman for the line items, testified as follows:

The Alaskan Air Command is responsible for providing early warning in the Alaskan area in case of attack against the United States. It is also responsible for the air defense of Alaska, and furnished operational and certain logistical support for the Strategic Air Command, the Military Air Transport Service, the Command of the Alaskan Sea Frontier, and the U.S. Army. To provide for the accomplishment of these missions, the command supports three major operational bases, Eielson, Elmendorf, and Ladd.

So, less than a month earlier, Ladd Field was referred to as one of the three operational Air Force bases in Alaska, but now it is reduced to an aero medical laboratory, a hospital, and some housing which it is hoped the Army in Alaska may be induced to occupy, although its

1960

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

9669

forces are not to be increased by a single soldier.

Mr. President, even before the world-shaking events that have come to us from Paris, even before the prospects of improvement in international tension had been rudely shattered at the summit, the discussion on the floor of the Senate last Friday, in connection with the adoption of the military construction bill, shows how little justification there was for these rapid changes by the Air Force. Let me point out that in the new authorization for the military construction program totaling \$1,074 million, the Air Force received well over half—some \$726 million—far more than the Army, Navy, and other parts of the Defense Establishment received.

The able junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], chairman of the subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, who is in charge of the bill, stated:

Prior to the time the committee could complete consideration of the bill * * * the Department of the Air Force again drastically revised its air defense planning, although no testimony had been presented to indicate any major change in the air defense threat since the submission of the revised plan in June 1959.

And Senator STENNIS added:

The committee has not been able to reconcile the cancellation of these long-range ground-to-air defense missile sites located on the perimeter of our country while continuing those of shorter range primarily designed for last-minute protection of our cities and military installations.

And he says further:

Most of us felt all the time that too much money was being put in ground-to-air missiles at the expense of the affirmative or purely offensive weapons.

In view of all this, and much else that I will not bother to repeat, for it can be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of last Friday, Senator STENNIS reported that the committee has requested that the revised air defense plan be again reviewed in detail by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of Defense.

And finally, Senator STENNIS said—and this was last Friday:

The committee is still very uncertain as to exactly what the present situation is and certainly dissatisfied with the situation in its present state.

I do not wonder that it is dissatisfied. The entire Congress and the American people should be dissatisfied.

Still later in the discussion, our distinguished colleague from the State of South Dakota, FRANCIS CASE, a member of the committee, gave his view that the bill—to quote his words—is “to some extent, out of date”; and he stated that this was the case “because our military posture has been built around certain deployments abroad and because the present situation inevitably will affect the availability of some of the bases and fields that have been developed.”

Senator CASE was referring to the consequences of the discovery of the U-2 mission over Russia. But his comment took place before Nikita Khrushchev had virtually ruptured his relations with the President and with the summit meeting.

If the military situation in regard to the Air Force was cause for dissatisfaction on the part of the members of the Armed Services Committee last Friday, there is infinitely more cause for even greater dissatisfaction and for immediate revision, and revision upward, now.

Mr. President, we do not, to date, know what foreign bases the United States will be allowed to retain by the government of the countries in which they are located. We do not know whether our bases ring the Russia from which our spying missions have originated will be permitted to continue. But the one thing that we can be certain of is that whatever bases, whatever offensive or defensive strength we have in Alaska, will continue if only our military have the vision and understanding to reverse their incredible latest decision. Indeed, they should not merely carry out the plan of a month ago of replacing the 25 F-89 fighters at Ladd with more modern fighters, but actually by adding to the present fighter strength additional fighter planes.

I call upon the Armed Services Committees of both Houses and the Appropriations Committee immediately to look into this situation and to insist that the Air Force, at the very least, reverse its position and restore the fighter squadron to the northernmost American air base and the American air base nearest to Russia.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, the story of our meeting at the Pentagon with the Air Force officials, as published in the Anchorage Daily Times, and written by Mr. A. Robert Smith, its Washington correspondent, as well as two editorials from the Fairbanks News-Miner, from the issues of May 12 and May 13, respectively, entitled “Is Now the Time To Reduce Our Defenses?” and “Are We Expendable?” a letter from Gov. William A. Egan to the Secretary of Defense dated May 14, 1960, and the first page of a newsletter by Mary Lee Council, administrative assistant to my colleague, which summarizes the situation as he saw it coming from the Pentagon.

There being no objection, the articles, editorials, and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Anchorage (Alaska) Daily Times, May 11, 1960]

ALASKAN DEFENSES CUT; STATE SAID “NO LONGER KEY OUTPOST”—25 FIGHTERS AT LADD TO LEAVE; SOLDIERS SHOCKED

(By A. Robert Smith)

WASHINGTON.—Air Force officials have bluntly told the Alaska congressional delegation they no longer regard Alaska as a key defense outpost of the free world.

This was revealed today at a press conference held jointly by Senators BARTLETT, GRUENING and Representative RIVERS to disclose the outcome of a lengthy meeting they had late yesterday at the Pentagon. They disclosed that:

1. The 25 fighter-interceptor aircraft of the 449th Squadron at Ladd Air Force Base will all be removed from Alaska, starting in August and ending by January 1.

2. The Army may take over use of Ladd, but this will not mean any increase in Army strength in Alaska, only some shifting.

3. There is no plan for the Defense Department to build offensive or defensive missile bases in Alaska as was urgently recommended last year by Lt. Gen. Frank A. Armstrong, the Alaska commander.

4. The upshot of these developments is that Alaska's defensive strength will be reduced 25 percent, according to Gen. Curtis LeMay, deputy chief of staff.

But BARTLETT contended it means a reduction of nearly 50 percent, inasmuch as the cut of 25 fighters at Ladd leaves only 33 fighters in Alaska, all based at Elmendorf Air Force Base.

5. When asked by GRUENING whether he didn't agree with Gen. Billy Mitchell's estimate of the strategic importance of Alaska for defense, LeMay replied: “Frankly, no.”

BARTLETT termed these disclosures “dreadfully shocking” considering the state of world affairs.

“Peace hasn't been established with Russia,” he added.

GRUENING and his colleagues vowed to oppose these plans by attempting to arouse public and congressional sentiment against them, but they indicated little hope of success in overturning this military decision. The verdict has been made, the military officials said.

“This is obviously an economy move,” observed GRUENING, “directed by the Bureau of the Budget.” When he asked why they didn't cut out fat and waste instead of reducing strength, LeMay said he “didn't think the American people wanted to cut out fat.”

In support of its supposition that this was an economy move, the delegation noted that not long ago the Air Force announced it would substitute a superior, faster aircraft, the VooDoo, for F-89 fighters at Ladd which are becoming obsolete.

This indicated to the Alaskans that up until recently it was thought militarily wise to give Alaska improved interceptors, but that now it is no longer necessary to have them at all.

This unexplained shift was thought by the delegation to have been forced by budgetary limitations which caused the Air Force to take its choice rather than to deploy as much strength as it might have wished.

LeMay said the Air Force constantly bucks up against resistance to reducing its operations by congressional pressure such as the Alaskans put on, reported Gruening, inferring the General presumed they were interested only in the effect of the cut on the economy of Fairbanks.

“It isn't just the money, it's that those people are awfully close to Siberia and they are bound to get uneasy,” said BARTLETT.

Withdrawing the squadron will reduce the military personnel by 500 officers and men, plus supporting civilian employees. The delegation said it would have hurt the Alaska economy and the morale of all Alaska.

BARTLETT reported the Army is still studying the possibility of using Ladd, but no decision is expected until July 15. The Air Force plans to continue using some of the housing at the base for personnel at Eielson Air Base, 26 miles away, because Ladd's facilities are superior. The Arctic Aero Medical Lab at Ladd will not be affected.

The Alaskans were visibly incredulous at the news they were bluntly handed by the Pentagon, and particularly by the expressed attitude of LeMay, the tough, cigar-smoking former commander of the Strategic Air Command.

RIVERS said he pointed out Armstrong had feared the threat of 27 missile bases Russia had built in nearby Siberia. LeMay, he reported, said he didn't think Russia is doing much there. Asked what they thought LeMay meant, BARTLETT blurted out:

“God knows what he meant by anything he said.”

BARTLETT recalled Armstrong's plea for missiles and more defense for Alaska. He

said LeMay brushed it off as just the desires of a theater commander who had been overruled.

Was Armstrong consulted about the wisdom of the elimination of 25 fighters?

"Probably not," BARTLETT quoted LeMay as answering.

How will the mission of the 449th Squadron be handled after its removal?

"We can operate from the U.S. West Coast with long-range airplanes just as well as from Alaska," BARTLETT quoted LeMay as saying.

LeMay was asked what he thought would happen if Soviet bombers came over Alaska, as Armstrong envisioned in a public speech last year in which he said the Russians could knock out Alaska and move on to hit deep into the interior of the other States.

LeMay was reported to have replied he didn't think Soviet attacking aircraft would strike the United States via Alaska. He said that would be foolish because they would risk earlier detection on that route, presumably by the DEW line radar network.

BARTLETT said LeMay stated he thinks Eielson, the base from which SAC bombers are ready to strike back if necessary, is now of subordinate importance if Alaska is not of great importance any longer in the defense strategy of the United States.

GRUENING observed with irony that the White House just a few years ago thought Alaska so important for defense that it insisted that the whole northern section be set aside for possible military use as a condition for granting statehood.

BARTLETT observed, "This process of whitening down Alaska's defenses" has been underway for several years, bit by bit.

GRUENING also questioned the wisdom of cutting back on domestic bases while depending upon bases in foreign lands where America may have only a tenuous hold. He said LeMay brushed this off by saying that foreign bases were important.

LeMay also told the delegation he thought conditions were unfavorable in Alaska for military operations because the weather goes down to 60° below zero and the transportation costs are unusually high.

GRUENING scoffed at both contentions. He noted that when Alaska Steamship Co. recently announced increased freight rates, Alaskans were unable to get the armed services to join them in protesting this increase.

BARTLETT, a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, was particularly disturbed by these developments. Last fall he toured military bases along the Pacific rim from Alaska to Japan and returned convinced that U.S. defenses needed boosting rather than reducing. His pleas to that effect have fallen on deaf ears here.

[From the Fairbanks (Alaska) Daily News-Miner, May 12, 1960]

IS NOW THE TIME TO REDUCE OUR DEFENSES?

Yesterday's News-Miner had two front page headlines: "Military Cuts Strength Here," followed by "Khrushchev May Not Want Visit From Ike."

The first headline preceded an announcement by Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Vice Chief of Staff of the U.S. Air Force, that one of the two fighter squadrons stationed in Alaska would be eliminated within the next few months; that before the year is out, the 449th Fighter Group, manning America's and Alaska's farthest north defense post, will move south.

The fighter base closest to Russia will be abandoned as a fighter base. America's first line of defense will retreat southward several hundred miles.

Ladd Air Force Base, home of the 449th, and Ladd's host city of Fairbanks will no longer be the first line of defense.

Result of this action, in plain language, is that Ladd and Fairbanks will be left as sitting ducks out in the middle of no man's land, between the Soviet armed forces concentrated in strength a relative few miles north and west, and America's shrunken farthest north defense post at Elmendorf Air Force Base to the south.

It is ironical that on the very day announcement is made of America's first-line defense post is to be wiped out, Soviet Premier Khrushchev baldly indicates a worsening relationship with the United States with a clearcut insult to President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Taking into account Premier Khrushchev's current statements, circumstances would seem to indicate strengthening of our defense posts closest to Russia as the Soviets maintain their belligerent status.

Public announcement America is cutting defensive strength of Alaska's formidable air patrol in the far North hardly seems the most effective way to soften Russia's present hard-nosed belligerency. Why should the bully slow his blustering when his proposed opponent is running away? Is blustering Khrushchev going to be intimidated when he sees our air defense retreating several hundred miles? We think not.

In yesterday's announcement, General LeMay, longtime plain-talking boss of SAC, Air Force offensive arm, took a position diametrically opposed to many other able top Air Force commanders. From the time of Gen. Billy Mitchell to today's Alaska top commander, Lt. Gen. Frank A. Armstrong, Alaska has been given top priority in world air strategy.

General LeMay's present position appears to be a casual writeoff of Alaska's strategic importance in defense of the United States.

We disagree with General LeMay.

We particularly disagree when results of his decision will not only reduce defensive strength of America's first line of defense by approximately 50 percent, but will in the process leave Fairbanks and Ladd Air Force Base sitting out in the middle of no man's land like ducks in a shooting gallery.

[From the Fairbanks (Alaska) Daily News-Miner, May 13, 1960]

ARE WE EXPENDABLE?

Gen. Curtis LeMay, Deputy Chief of Staff of the Air Force, would have us believe that, militarily, Alaska is expendable.

He is quoted as saying that Alaska is no longer of great importance in the defense strategy of the United States. This statement was given to Alaska's congressional delegation in justification of the Air Force's plans to cut the strength of Ladd Air Force Base by withdrawing the 449th Fighter Interceptor Squadron.

The action comes at a most inopportune time—a time when world tensions have reached a high peak—a time when every facet of defense needs strengthening instead of weakening.

It is hard to believe that General LeMay's dogmatic view on Alaska's strategic importance is shared widely in military circles.

Starting with Gen. Billy Mitchell's evaluation of the importance of Alaska as key to the continent's defense to similar views expressed more recently by Lt. Gen. Frank A. Armstrong, Alaska's present military commander, Alaska's vital role in the military picture has never been minimized.

On March 17, 1958, Franklin L. Orth, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army told the Anchorage Chamber of Commerce he considers Alaska "the keystone in the arch of our defensive system."

Orth added: "Alaska has now become the strongest defensive link in our outpost of freedom."

Lt. Gen. J. H. Atkinson, formerly commander in chief of the Alaskan command, told the Alaska Chamber of Commerce: "As we all know, Alaska is an outpost of our continental defense, and I cannot overemphasize its importance in the strategic picture. It is a shoulder of the Polar Basin, that most critical area which separates us from Siberia and from the heartland of Russia itself."

In a later speech, General Atkinson declared: "It is logical to assume that if Alaska is a desirable location strategically from which to fly manned aircraft against enemy targets, it will be an equally desirable strategic location from which to launch unmanned aircraft—namely, missiles."

General Atkinson based his remarks on the contention that range will always be an important factor in that it is cheaper to send an aircraft or missile 500 miles than 5,000 miles.

It is even more surprising and shocking as Senator BARTLETT says—that after all these views on Alaska's value to American defense from responsible military leaders we are told that Alaska is expendable.

It is even more surprising and shocking for taxpayers in Alaska and elsewhere to be told that the millions of dollars spent to construct strong military outposts in Alaska are now construed to be in vain and useless.

We are not military men, nor have we made a thorough study of military concepts and strategy. Yet we cannot see the wisdom of weakening and neutralizing the one American State which is closest to America's greatest potential enemy.

We cannot see the wisdom of deciding that more than 200,000 Americans in America's largest State are expendable and apparently to be left without adequate defenses.

We wonder if the Russians would apply the same sort of thinking to the vast reaches of Siberia, the Kamchatka Peninsula or other key points in their defense system?

We still believe—and we are convinced our view would have firm support in military circles—that Alaska is a highly important segment of our national military picture. We believe that from a standpoint of continental defense, our Government should retain Alaskan defenses at a high level. We believe that instead of stripping Alaska of her defenses, these changes should be augmented with both missiles and aircraft.

America's national security should not be sold down the river so casually.

To weaken Alaska now would be to create an inviting "Pearl Harbor" which would prove extremely tempting to our potential enemies, and harmful to our national security.

Is Alaska expendable? We must disagree most emphatically with those who feel it is. Alaska is not only expendable—it is America's most important shield against an aggressor.

Loss of Alaska could prove a crippling blow to the entire defense of America.

STATE OF ALASKA,
Juneau, May 14, 1960.

HON. THOMAS S. GATES, JR.,
Secretary of Defense,
The Pentagon, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This is to protest, in feelings stronger than words can convey, the recently disclosed decision of the Air Force to deactivate the 449th Fighter Interceptor Squadron at the Ladd Air Force Base.

I do so because of my deep concern with the effect of this reduction, predicated, apparently, solely on budgetary considerations, upon the Nation's defenses.

It is my understanding that the 449th represents more than 40 percent of the existing fighter strength in Alaska. With its depar-

THE NEWS FROM PARIS ON INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the news from Paris will cause a wave of regret and disappointment all over the world. Apparently the prospects of any kind of a successful conference at the summit are virtually dead.

At no time were the prospects of great accomplishment from the summit conference better than 50-50. But the abrupt manner in which they seem to be coming to an end foreshadows a period of greater tensions and greater agony for a war-weary world.

Inspired stories from Communist sources seem to be indicating already that the world may be plunged into a crisis over Berlin. For whatever reason, the Communist leaders seem bent on forcing issues, rather than seeking to resolve them.

It is evident that the determination and the unity of the American people are going to be tested as never before in our history. The so-called cold war puts a heavy strain on the nerves and the hearts of people everywhere in the world.

This is definitely a time for Americans to unite, because something very precious is at stake—freedom in this world.

If there have been mistakes, responsibility will be assessed coolly and objectively. But one mistake that we cannot afford to make is to weaken the free world by division within our own ranks.

America should try to keep open every channel of communication, because it is always better to talk than to fight. But keeping open every channel of communication in good faith does not mean that we should relax our determination to maintain freedom as a way of life.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to join in the statement which has been made by the distinguished majority leader. His statement exhibits his well-known pattern of statesmanship and responsibility, and especially so in the grave crisis which confronts all of us at the present time.

THE RIGHT OF THE CONGRESS TO BE INFORMED

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. MEYER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

(Mr. MEYER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, I believe that our rights as Members of this House have been and are infringed upon.

As an aftermath of the U-2 plane incident over Soviet Russia we heard the following on this floor:

Although the Members of the House have not generally been informed on the subject the mission was one of a series and part of an established program with which the subcommittee in charge of the program was familiar and of which it had been fully apprised during this and previous sessions.

However, earlier in the other body one Member stated that neither he nor any other member of the Select Appropriations Subcommittee which has for 13 years passed on the Central Intelligence Agency budget had ever heard that it operated planes.

When I subscribed to the following oath of office—

I, WILLIAM H. MEYER, do solemnly swear that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion, and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.

I obligated myself to fulfill it and to fulfill it regardless of what others might do that might interfere with my obligation. I say that the previous statements in both bodies leave me confused as to what actually has happened in secret. Nevertheless and regardless, I claim that my sincere attempt to fulfill my oath of office is being obstructed and that this is harmful to my country. I wish to quote these excerpts from our Constitution that relate to my claim.

To begin with, we are charged with the following duties at various points in the Constitution of the United States:

1. * * * Raising revenue.
2. Lay and collect taxes * * * and provide for the common defense.
3. To declare war.
4. To raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than 2 years.
5. To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces.
6. To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

I would like also to quote the following excerpts from the Constitution:

7. No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law; and a regular statement and account of the receipts and expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time.

The President, Vice President, and all civil officers of the United States, shall be removed from office on impeachment for, and conviction of, treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors.

9. The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

Then I want to repeat the sentence contained in an amendment to the Constitution:

I say that as a Representative to Congress I must know what is going on if I am to fulfill my duties. I and the vast majority of Congressmen cannot do this if either the House or Senate statements previously mentioned by me reflect the conditions we operate under. There can be no first-class and second-class separation of Congressmen. We all must have equal access to those facts without which we cannot fulfill our oath of office and our constitutional duties.

No man can tell me that I have any greater duty than to safeguard the rights of Congress and our people when the threat of actions leading to war are so ominous. War must be prevented, and at the very least it must not come while our people and Congress are purposefully kept in the dark as to facts and acts that are by law supposed to be available to them and under their control. No one has the right to arrogate special powers to himself especially when they belong equally to others and particularly when the life and future of our people and country are at stake as the clouds of a war of unknown destructiveness gather in the sky.

I ask that the appropriate committees and Members of the House investigate this matter and prepare the proper reports leading to remedial action.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with these items from the Constitution which I have quoted, I would like to add a little bit that has been in the papers and elsewhere. For instance, it seems to me, under the constitutional provisions relating to the common defense and declaration of war, we could consider this one:

Green Hackworth's authoritative work on "International Law as Interpreted and Applied by the United States" has much documentation on the international law concerning violation of natural jurisdiction over air space which leaves no doubt of the illegality of the present practice.

Even our own Government forbids commercial planes of other countries to enter our airspace without a permit from the Civil Aeronautics Authority; and, certainly, if this is the case, it is obvious that the intrusion of espionage and military planes would certainly be prohibited and that they would not be permitted to invade our air space.

Furthermore, I would say under raising revenue and also laying and collecting taxes and providing for the common defense and declaring war: Is there no responsible control over the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency? That these spy flights, with all their inherent danger of precipitating war, have been going on for 4 years is alarming enough. But that such a fight should have been sent out at this moment just before the

summit meeting indicates either incredible stupidity or a positive desire to sabotage this meeting of heads of state from which the whole world had hoped for an easing of tensions, a test ban treaty, and some insurance of human survival through disarmament.

Second—If unarmed, and possibly armed flights of this illegal kind are common practice, is it not true that the power to plunge us into war now rests with any one of hundreds, many of whom may be willing to gamble their lives, and perhaps the lives of all humanity for the high pay involved, or because they think they are performing a service? And also under the points I previously mentioned from the Constitution and many others, I would ask, thirdly: What, of the superior morality claimed by the Government which lies and, when caught, justifies the act which it tried to hide by claiming that it was no worse than acts done by a totalitarian Communist Government, whose immorality it consistently condemns?

Mr. Speaker, one Member of the other body has said that the United States was an aggressor in sending a U-2 spy plane deep into Russia. I might not go that far, but I would at least say that we certainly could be under suspicion of that, and that many of our allies and friends throughout the world have been adversely affected by this news.

Furthermore, this same person said it was a risk that could lead to nuclear war if continued; and he added that there is no justification for getting military intelligence through aggression. Whether this is described as aggression or not I would say that it could be so interpreted; and I would agree that whereas we need military information and many other forms of intelligence we should not allow ourselves to be placed in a position where it could be interpreted as aggression, not if we want to stand before the world as the country that we really claim to be and which we really are.

I am not going to say too much more about what another gentleman said, but he did say that he was in favor of getting military intelligence, but in ways that we can reconcile with international comity. I think that is a sensible statement.

Another thing I would like to call to the attention of this body, Mr. Speaker—and these are not my words, but the words of another—we speak of our free society. It is not free if the people are committed to actions which conflict with our stated diplomatic aims, though having no knowledge of these actions, no control over them, and no way of knowing who is to blame when mistakes are made. This is the way totalitarian societies work. This same type of thinking is part of the reason I am speaking now today. I feel that we must consider these matters if we are to maintain our traditional position, if we are to maintain those things which we stand for, and if we are to resolve the problems that are before the world.

Furthermore, I would like to quote from a column by Marguis Childs in the Washington Post for May 13.

He is over in Geneva now. He states: America's position is rapidly deteriorating because the visible signs of leadership, the friendly grin to one side, are fewer and fewer. The tragedy of the U-2 illuminated this as with a lightning flash. The universal regret and sorrow in the European press, even in West Germany where there is a confused desire to cling to the concept of American infallibility, are expressed in terms of restraint that cloak dismay and indignation.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on for a long time with many other quotes and many other references to the Constitution and the traditions of our country in the past.

I do not want to be in the position in which I am playing what would be called partisan politics. That does not enter into the picture at all. But neither can we afford to be bipartisan. There is a difference. We can be nonpartisan, and when the national interest of the United States is at stake I, for myself, prefer to be nonpartisan rather than bipartisan. I believe that someone must speak out and correct this tragic comedy of errors. The people who are at fault must in some way be told to change some of the acts, some of the thinking that is leading them to do these things. Somehow or other we must find a better way.

I have just learned from the news wire what Mr. Krushchev has said. He has demanded an abject apology from our President, he is demanding that we admit that we are aggressors. I feel in this case he has gone much too far if he is a sincere man who really wants to negotiate. His language is offensive. It is not conducive to the best negotiations which we must have.

However, I feel that we as Americans, that we as Members of Congress, have as our first duty to correct that which is within us which may be wrong, and at the same time help to correct that which is wrong elsewhere in the world, and that only in this way can we achieve the fine and noble goals which we as Americans all desire.

was indicted and tried in New York. He was convicted; and the court of appeals affirmed the conviction on July 11, 1958. The Supreme Court affirmed the conviction on March 28, 1960; and the Supreme Court on May 16, 1960, refused further review.

Rudolf Ivanovich Abel on August 7, 1957, was indicted on three counts charging him with having conspired from about 1948 to the date of the indictment, first, to communicate and transmit to the Soviet Union information relating to the national defense of the United States—conspiracy to violate 18 United States Code 794(a)—second, to obtain documents and other materials connected with the national defense of the United States for the purpose of transmitting such documents to the Soviet Union—conspiracy to violate 18 United States Code 793—and third, to act in the United States as an agent of the Soviet Union without prior notification to the Secretary of State—conspiracy to violate 18 United States Code 951.

The petitioner was convicted and sentenced to a total of 30 years and to pay a fine of \$3,000. The conviction was affirmed by the court of appeals, and then was appealed to the Supreme Court.

On October 13, 1958, the Supreme Court granted certiorari. Briefs were filed, and the case was argued on February 17 and 18, 1959. The questions presented to the Court were first, whether the fourth and fifth amendments to the Constitution are violated by a search and the seizure of evidence without a search warrant, after an alien suspected and officially accused of espionage has been taken into custody for deportation, pursuant to an administrative Immigration Service warrant, but has not been arrested for the commission of a crime; and second, whether the fourth and fifth amendments are violative when articles so seized are unrelated to the Immigration Service warrant and, together with other articles obtained from such leads, are introduced as evidence in a prosecution for espionage.

Mr. President, in this connection, I should like to include in my remarks a complete copy of the indictment. If there is anything that stands at this moment as eloquent evidence of the kind of espionage carried on in this country by agents of the Soviet Union, this is it. After going through all the courts of the land, and twice to the highest court, the conviction has been affirmed; and the defendant will go to the Federal penitentiary for a period of 30 years, where he rightly belongs.

I should like to have both the Congress and the country know—since such items in text form do not always come to the attention of those who read the press and the magazines—just what is involved in this case. Therefore, I wish to have a copy of the complete indictment printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so the people generally can see whether espionage by agents of the United States.

There being no objection, the indictment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DISTRICT COURT, EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK—UNITED STATES OF AMERICA v. RUDOLF IVANOVICH ABEL, ALSO KNOWN AS "MARK" AND ALSO KNOWN AS MARTIN COLLINS AND EMIL R. GOLDFUS, DEFENDANT.
The grand jury charges:

COUNT ONE

1. That from in or about 1948 and continuously thereafter up to and including the date of the filing of this indictment, in the eastern district of New York; in Moscow, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; and elsewhere, Rudolf Ivanovich Abel, also known as "Mark" and also known as Martin Collins and Emil R. Goldfus, the defendant herein, unlawfully, willfully and knowingly did conspire and agree with Reino Hayhanen, also known as "Vic"; Mikhail Svirin; Vitali G. Pavlov; and Aleksandr Mikhailovich Korotkov, coconspirators but not defendants herein, and with divers other persons to the grand jury unknown, to violate subsection (a) of section 794, title 18, United States Code, in that they did unlawfully, willfully and knowingly conspire and agree to communicate, deliver and transmit to a foreign government, to wit, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and representatives and agents thereof, directly and indirectly, documents, writings, photographs, photographic negatives, plans, maps, models, notes, instruments, appliances and information relating to the national defense of the United States of America, and particularly information relating to arms, equipment and disposition of U.S. Armed Forces, and information relating to the atomic energy program of the United States with intent and reason to believe that the said documents, writings, photographs, photographic negatives, plans, maps, models, notes, instruments, appliances and information would be used to the advantage of a foreign nation, to wit, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

2. It was a part of said conspiracy that the defendant and his coconspirators would collect and obtain, and attempt to collect and obtain and would aid and induce divers other persons to the grand jury unknown, to collect and obtain information relating to the national defense of the United States of America, with intent and reason to believe that the said information would be used to the advantage of the said foreign nation, to wit, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

3. It was further a part of said conspiracy that the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and certain of the coconspirators, including Aleksandr Mikhailovich Korotkov and Mikhail Svirin, being representatives, agents and employees of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, would by personal contact, communications and other means to the grand jury unknown, both directly and indirectly, employ, supervise, pay and maintain the defendant and other coconspirators for the purpose of communicating, delivering and transmitting information relating to the national defense of the United States to the said Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

4. It was further a part of said conspiracy that the defendant and certain of his coconspirators would activate and attempt to activate as agents within the United States certain members of the U.S. Armed Forces who were in a position to acquire information relating to the national defense of the United States, and would communicate, deliver, and transmit, and would aid and induce each other and divers other persons to the grand jury unknown, to communicate, deliver, and transmit information relating to the national defense of the United States

CONVICTION OF RUDOLF IVANOVICH ABEL—OPINION OF THE SUPREME COURT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, yesterday the Supreme Court of the United States affirmed an earlier action in the case of one Rudolf Ivanovich Abel, who

THE TRAGEDY AT PARIS—INTERPRETATIONS BY WALTER LIPPMANN

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, Walter Lippmann's Thin are the ranks of those who do. But Walter Lippmann has other strengths besides—a rare combination of courage which gives him a fierce independence, and integrity which impels him to state the facts as he sees them, regardless of how unpleasant, unpopular, or unpolitic they may be. These attributes have made him the giant of American journalism.

Walter Lippmann's interpretations of the reasons for the tragedy at Paris are, characteristically, quite different from the commonplace excuses now being widely circulated in the press. But when historians search for the hard truth concerning the debacle at the summit meeting in Paris, they are more likely to find it in two articles he has written during the past week, than in all the rest of the

explanations offered from all other sources.

I ask unanimous consent that these two articles, published in the Washington Post on May 12, 1960, and May 17, 1960, may be printed in proper sequence at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 12, 1960]

THE SPY BUSINESS (By Walter Lippmann)

In the whirl of incidents following the capture of the spy plane the administration has ventured, perhaps the right word for it would be stumbled, into an untenable policy which is entirely unprecedented in international affairs. Our position now seems to be that because it is so difficult to collect information inside the Soviet Union, it will henceforth be our avowed policy to fly over Soviet territory, using the territory of our allies as bases.

Although the intention here is to be candid and honest and also to make the best of a piece of very bad luck, the new policy—which seems to have been improvised between Saturday and Monday—is quite unworkable.

To avow that we intend to violate Soviet sovereignty is to put everybody on the spot. It makes it impossible for the Soviet Government to play down this particular incident because now it is challenged openly in the face of the whole world. It is compelled to react because no nation can remain passive when it is the avowed policy of another nation to intrude upon its territory. The avowal of such a policy is an open invitation to the Soviet Government to take the case to the United Nations, where our best friends will be grievously embarrassed. The avowal is also a challenge to the Soviet Union to put pressure on Pakistan, Turkey, Norway, Japan, and any other country which has usable bases. Our allies are put on the spot because they must either violate international law or disavow the United States.

Because the challenge has been made openly, it is almost impossible to deal with this particular incident by quiet diplomacy.

my criticism is that we have made these overflights in avowed policy. What is unprecedented about the avowal is not the spying as such but the claim that spying, when we do it, should be accepted by the world as righteous. This is an amateurish and naive view of the nature of spying.

Spying between nations is, of course, the universal practice. Everybody does it as best he can. But it is illegal in all countries, and the spy if caught is subject to the severest punishment. When the spying involves intrusion across frontiers by military aircraft, it is also against international law. Because spying is illegal, its methods are often immoral and criminal. Its methods include bribery, blackmail, perjury, forgery, murder, and suicide.

The spy business cannot be conducted without illegal, immoral, and criminal activities. But all great powers are engaged in the spy business, and as long as the world is as warlike as it has been in all recorded history there is no way of doing without spying.

All the powers know this and all have accepted the situation as one of the hard facts of life. Around this situation there has developed over many generations a code of behavior. The spying is never avowed and therefore the Government never acknowledges responsibility for its own clandestine activities. If its agent is caught, the agent is expected to kill himself. In any event, he is abandoned to the mercies of the government that he has spied upon.

The spying is never admitted. If it can be covered successfully by a lie, the lie is told.

All this is not a pretty business, and there is no way of prettifying it or transforming it into something highly moral and wonderful. The cardinal rule, which makes spying tolerable in international relations, is that it is never avowed. For that reason it is never defended, and therefore the aggrieved country makes only as much of a fuss about a particular incident as it can make or as it chooses to make.

We should have abided by that rule. When Mr. K. made his first announcement about the plane, no lies should have been told. The administration should have said that it was investigating the charge and would then take suitable action. We should then have maintained a cool silence.

This would have left us, of course, with the unpleasant fact that our spy plane had been caught. What really compounded our trouble, and was such a humiliation to us, is that before we knew how much Mr. K. knew we published this official lie about its being a weather plane. Then, finding ourselves trapped in this blatant and gratuitous lie, we have tried to extricate ourselves by rushing into the declaration of a new and unprecedented policy.

[From the Washington Post, May 17, 1960]

THE U-2 IN PARIS (By Walter Lippmann)

As of Monday afternoon, eastern time, there is only the faintest chance that the summit meeting will not break up. It is certain that the President will not go to Russia, the invitation having been withdrawn. Thus, the attempt to arrive at a truce in the cold war, and to relax the tensions has, unless there is a diplomatic miracle, ended in a tragic fiasco.

The issue on which the conference has been disrupted is the flight of the U-2, or more precisely the position taken by the President and his administration. We must remember that when the plane was captured, Mr. Khrushchev opened the door to the President for a diplomatic exit from his quandary: He did not believe, said Mr. K., that Mr. Eisenhower was responsible for ordering the flight.

Undoubtedly Mr. K. knew that Mr. Eisenhower must have authorized the general plan of the flights but he preferred to let the President say what in fact was a sorry kind of truth, that he did not authorize this particular flight. The diplomatic answer

would have been to say nothing at the time or at the most to promise an adequate investigation of the whole affair. Instead, Mr. Eisenhower replied that he was responsible, that such flights were necessary, and then he let the world think even if he did not say so in exact words that the flights would continue. This locked the door which Mr. Khrushchev had opened. It transformed the embarrassment of being caught in a spying operation into a direct challenge to the sovereignty of the Soviet Union.

This avowal, this refusal to use the convention of diplomacy was a fatal mistake. For it made it impossible for Mr. Khrushchev to bypass the affair. Had he done that, he would have been in a position of acknowledging to the world, to the Soviet people, to his critics within the Soviet Union, and to his Communist allies, that he had surrendered to the United States the right to violate Soviet territory. No statesman can live in any country after making such an admission.

The news from Paris on Monday shows that Mr. Eisenhower had already realized that his making an avowed policy of the flights was a crucial mistake which had to be corrected. On Saturday there was, it appears, a briefing of the correspondents to

tell them that we had never meant to say that the flights would continue. On Sunday in a broadcast in this country Mr. George V. Allen said the same thing. And on Monday the President told Mr. Khrushchev that the flights over Russia have been suspended "and are not to be resumed." A week ago this might have sufficed to quiet down the affair.

The withdrawal was, however, late, and it may prove to have been too little. For during the past week the flight and the way it was handled have given the Soviet Government a rich opportunity to weaken the ring of America's allies around Russia. Those who say that Mr. K. has seized upon the opportunity solely in order to make propaganda have not, I think, realized the gravity of the disaster which has befallen us. For the Soviet Union there is in this much more than propaganda. There is an instrument for disturbing if not disrupting the encircling alliance.

It would be wishful thinking to suppose that the Soviet Government will not seize this opportunity to push countries like Norway, Iran, Pakistan, Turkey, and Japan into pledges and into measures which in some considerable degree neutralize them as American airbases. Morally and legally these allies of ours are defenseless against these Soviet demands.

The Soviet Government is at least as interested in neutralizing our allies around her borders as she is in neutralizing West Berlin. We dare not hope that the Soviet Government will not make the most of the opportunity which has so unexpectedly and so unnecessarily been opened up to her.

Before the affair of the plane there had been, as Mr. Reston wrote on Monday from Paris, a strong indication that Mr. Khrushchev was very uneasy about the prospects of the summit meeting. I myself was one of those who talked to his personal emissary, Mr. Zhukov, when he came to Washington in April. The burden of Mr. Zhukov's complaint was that about March 15 American policy had suddenly hardened against a negotiation about the status of West Berlin, and that this was a reversal of the understanding given to Mr. K. by the President at Camp David.

Almost certainly, therefore, the affair of the plane offered Mr. K. an opportunity to make a diplomatic gain against the small encircling allies from Norway to Japan. If he was stymied in Berlin, he had the chance to recoup elsewhere. We have not heard the last of the troubles of the encircling allies.

There is not much comfort for us in this. For our own blunders provided Mr. K. with his opportunity.

At this writing it is still conceivable that a way will be found to carry on in Paris. Let us hope so.

MAY 18 1960

1960

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

9759

which may be employed on a graduated scale without an irrevocable commitment to combat.

The options provided the decision-makers may vary from an increased ground alert posture to launching of the force subject to recall.

For instance, in times of stress it is difficult to let the world know, particularly potential enemies, that the readiness of the ballistic missile force has been stepped up. Nothing happens that anyone can see, whereas stepping up the readiness of the manned aircraft force on alert or initiation of or airborne alert is visible to friend and foe alike.

Furthermore, to display response in a tense situation, manned vehicles could be sent to where they would be seen by allies, or even picked up on radar screens of an enemy.

The aging B-47's are planned to be phased out of the Air Force inventory by the midsixties. Also, during the midsixties the earlier model B-52's will begin to be phased out.

This condition, coupled with an ever increasing Soviet defensive posture, requires modernization of our manned strategic capability.

An analysis of payload, range, speed, and penetration capabilities shows the B-70 to be the weapon system best suited to fulfill that requirement.

The B-70 would provide the Air Force with the most advanced, manned strategic system that the state of art now permits. It is unique, in that it has been designed expressly for continued operation in the supersonic environment.

It will travel the entire distance of its very great range at Mach 3, which is roughly 2,100 miles an hour. This represents a major aeronautical breakthrough, since it transcends the heat barrier, and conceivably opens the door to much greater speeds and further major advances in aeronautical science.

The principal technical factor which now permits attainment of a supersonic transport is the radical improvement in flight efficiency, which results in adequate range at acceptable fuel costs. Flight efficiency is the product of aerodynamic efficiency and propulsive efficiency. In considering aerodynamic efficiency, we find that a drastic decrease in lift-to-drag ratio occurs when sonic speed is reached and passed. However, recent developments and design refinements, such as the compression-lift principle, have substantially raised lift-drag ratios in the Mach 3 region. In compression-lift design, the aircraft wing is positioned on the supersonic shock wave, so that it derives additional lift from the increased air pressure behind the wave. It may be said that, in effect, the airplane "rides" its own shock wave. Thus, we see that by proper design we can translate increased speed into improved aerodynamic efficiency.

Furthermore, the attainable propulsive efficiency increases with increasing flight speed. The combination of the two factors produces flight efficiencies approaching those of present-day, high-subsonic aircraft. Still further improvement is anticipated in this area.

This speed means, for example, that in times of stress, if B-70's were on alert over the polar regions, and it was decided to attack, they would be over Moscow before an ICBM launched from this country could reach Moscow.

Penetration studies show that the B-70 will have excellent penetration capabilities. This capability is derived primarily from the airplane's speed and altitude; and this capability would be further enhanced by countermeasures, decoys, and air-to-surface missiles—all used under the monitorship of a human brain.

The B-70 is designed to carry a variable internal payload. It can carry several large bombs or a great many very small ones.

One of the problems in space research and military space work is the boost required to propel payloads through the lower dense atmosphere into space. It may be possible to realize substantial savings by launching space vehicles from the B-70 using it as a recoverable, first-stage booster instead of launching from the ground.

Of growing importance is the possible need for a defense against satellites. In this regard, the maneuvering ability, speed, and large load-carrying capacity of the B-70 offers great potential as an antisatellite weapons carrier, and possibly as a long-range platform for air defense missiles.

Additionally, the B-70's design, with the crew far removed from the engines, may be, with certain types of nuclear reactors, adaptable for nuclear propulsion.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am speaking on limited time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Arizona has expired.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, may I have 6 more minutes?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Arizona may have 10 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I do not expect to use the 10 minutes, but now I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, is the Senator from Arizona at liberty to disclose the planned cruising altitude of the B-70?

Mr. GOLDWATER. The planned cruising altitude is 70,000 feet, but I believe it will be higher than that.

Mr. AIKEN. Would the utilization of the B-70 necessitate the remarking of airports or airfields?

Mr. GOLDWATER. No.

Mr. AIKEN. What length of strips would be required for takeoff or landing?

Mr. GOLDWATER. The lengths and thicknesses of present runways for B-52's would suffice for the B-70's. In the construction of new runways, it would be desirable to make them longer, but it is not necessary.

Mr. AIKEN. A 10,000-foot runway would accommodate a B-70, then?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. Of course, the weight would depend on whether the plane was loaded or not, and the required ballast of the runway would depend on the weight of the plane.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I may say to the Senator from Vermont that, in my opinion, any modern B-52 or B-47 runway would handle a B-70.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the B-70 offers the potential for assuming the role of rapid strategic airlift or paving the way for mach 3 transport aircraft.

Just as the B-52/KC-135 developments paved the way for jet transportation, so the B-70 would initiate mach 3 transportation, freight, and passenger.

Under conditions of total weapons control a mach 3 transport utilizing the B-70 design features would provide the United States the flexibility of rapidly transitioning from transport aircraft to weapon system should such a need arise.

The recent disclosure by the CIA and the State Department and the President on a successful penetration of Russia's heartland by the U-2 should be added reason for quickly going ahead with full development of the B-70 program. The reason that the U-2 was able to operate, and is still able to operate with immunity in the skies over Russia, is that it can fly at an altitude higher than any of Russia's interceptors can reach and higher than the effective range of any of its ground-to-air missiles. Russia abandoned her supersonic program in aircraft, and for that reason she has not developed a fighter capable of effectively reaching the altitudes at which this reconnaissance plane flies. If a reconnaissance version of the B-70 could come off the lines in a short time from now, we would have started an arm of our Air Force that could revolutionize the entire field of reconnaissance. This craft flying at mach 3, at altitudes above 80,000 feet, could with immunity give surveillance to any part of the world and keep us constantly posted on the actions and progress of any potential enemy, wherever he might be.

A manned airplane is required as an essential and integral element of the strategic posture.

The B-70 is the weapon system which best fulfills the requirement for a manned follow-on aircraft to the B-52.

The B-70 offers the potential of additional required roles, including nuclear-powered airplanes, first-stage boosters to space launchings, and mach 3 transportation.

The B-70 offers a reconnaissance type aircraft that could fly above the effective range of any enemy aircraft or missile, and at speeds over three times of any known enemy interceptor.

Our Government could then go to the United Nations with a statement that it was clearly obvious that to help insure the peace of the world, a constant surveillance should be made of the entire globe and that this surveillance would

9760

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 18

be, so to speak, "posted on the bulletin board" for every member of the United Nations to see. Daily, yes, even hourly, observations of all the world from these altitudes could result in information which could certainly prevent any massive surprise attack being launched by one nation against another. Now, the United Nations would probably turn this down so we would then go to NATO and make the same proposal that we, with our B-70's, would provide a flying watchdog for the world, and that gathered information would be the property of the world. It is reasonable to expect that NATO would reject this, so then, as a last resort, the United States could say to the world that we know if the world could be kept posted as to the activities of all nations on a real basis, the dangers of any overt attack could be virtually removed, and that, desiring peace as strongly as we do, we would provide this surveillance at our own expense.

If an enemy power is bent on conquering a nation, and proposes to turn all of its resources to that end, that power is at war with the nation; and the latter—unless it contemplates surrender—is at war with him.

"These are the times that try men's souls," said Thomas Paine when we were struggling through the war that brought us independence. If he were alive today, he could well repeat that, or say, "Now is the time that tries men's courage."

TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF REA

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, rural electrification has been one of the most important developments in the progress of America and of American agriculture. It has revolutionized the workload on the farm and it has immensely benefited the family farm. Beyond this, it has enabled farm families to enjoy cultural values and a standard of living previously not possible. Perhaps no group can express more appreciative thanks than the farm wives of America who have seen the values brought to their homes and their families by rural electrification.

This great change has been accomplished in the past 25 years, and largely through the processes set in motion by President Franklin Roosevelt. The Rural Electrification Administration began with his Executive order in May 1935. Since then the percentage of farms in the United States with electricity has increased from less than 11 percent to more than 96 percent. In Minnesota only 6.8 percent of the farms were electrified in 1935, as compared to 95.6 percent today.

On the 25th anniversary of the establishment of REA, it is appropriate to commend the foresight of President Roosevelt and of the congressional leaders who supported and expanded the program. At the same time, the success of the rural electrification program is also the achievement of rural citizens. Rural electrification has been accomplished, not by government ownership or operation, but essentially as a private venture. The role of Government has been to provide funds for loans, just as it did for in-

dustry under the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Although several forms of private enterprise were eligible to borrow for rural electrical expansion, most of the initiative came from rural cooperatives formed for this purpose. Of the 1,085 firms which have borrowed through REA, 984 have been rural co-ops. Special recognition is due on this occasion to the thousands of farm leaders who had both the determination and the skill to create their own institutions.

Nearly 16 million rural people are now served by locally owned and managed rural electric systems, and more than half of the Nation's farms get their electricity through an REA borrower. Over 83 percent of the Minnesota farms are served by REA. Only North and South Dakota have a higher percentage of farmers belonging to REA. The unusual success of REA co-ops in Minnesota is a reflection of the long and successful experience of Minnesota farmers with cooperatives. Given a means to finance their own electrification system, Minnesota farmers went ahead with confidence and skill to serve all the farmers of the State. Over 80,000 miles of powerlines have been constructed under REA in Minnesota, giving the State the third highest REA mileage of any State in the Nation.

The record of REA borrowers is not only one of success in giving service to the entire community. It has also been one of fiscal success. Approximately \$3.5 billion has been loaned by REA in the past 25 years, and over \$1 billion has been repaid by borrowers in principal and interest. The REA loans in Minnesota have totaled about \$156 million, of which \$37 million has been repaid on the principal, and another \$20 million in interest. Repayments on loans are far ahead of schedule.

Today, the great majority of Members of Congress and citizens nationally agree on the value of the REA. It is an example of how Government can be used to extend freedom and independence for people.

Rural electrification was inevitable in the United States. Once started, it was simply a question of how fast it would come, of what form it would take, and of how many farmers would benefit. The Nation made its choice in democratic fashion and along lines consistent with democratic principles.

HE WHO WOULD BE SECURE AT HOME MUST BE SUPREME AT SEA

Mr. BUTLER. Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, has repeatedly and emphatically defined seapower in this way:

Seapower is not just men-of-war. It includes freighters, tramp steamers, passenger liners, tankers, and the many other ships which make up the merchant marine.

But seapower is even more than this. It is the sum total of weapons, ships, shipbuilding capacity, and geography which enable a nation to use the sea advantageously during peace and war.

The free world desperately needs the sea. The free world will not long remain free unless it controls the sea. The

community of free nations, who together compose a mighty strength, draws power from the sea, and is tied together by the arteries of the sea. Obviously, seapower will play a major, if not a predominant, role in any future emergency which can now be visualized.

Yet, it is increasingly remarkable that the United States—the cornerstone of the free world—would permit elements of its seapower to be deficient from a qualitative or quantitative standpoint. But that is exactly what is happening in terms of our merchant marine.

My colleagues, I am sure, will be alarmed, as I have been, by a recent appraisal of our ocean shipping resources and capabilities to support the defense of the United States, which has been prepared by the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point a letter, and attachments, dated March 11, 1960, received from Vice Adm. Ralph E. Wilson, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations—Logistics.

There being no objection, the letter and attachments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF
OF NAVAL OPERATIONS,
Washington, D.C., March 11, 1960.

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BUTLER: In your letter of February 17, 1960, you expressed interest in receiving a current appraisal of our maritime needs along the lines of the document dated February 21, 1959, and entitled "Ocean Shipping to Support the Defense of the United States." This paper has been revised to the present date, and a copy is enclosed for your information.

There has been little change in the substance of this appraisal since its last revision in February 1959. The bulk of our sea transportation resources have undergone another year's depreciation, and little has been accomplished in the way of either modernization or renewal.

The subsidized segment of the U.S.-flag merchant fleet remains at a few over 300 ships. The number of subsidized voyages authorized in the past year was a few more than in the year previous. There are a number of applications for subsidy pending. Although most of the subsidized shipping companies have entered into long-range ship replacement contracts, funding shortages have prevented actual replacement construction from being adequate. The rate of progress in the replacement of subsidized shipping depends on the future of construction differential subsidies. Our domestic shipbuilding industry is also largely dependent on this subsidy. In addition, the construction of the two superliner passenger ships authorized by the 85th Congress has not started due to financing difficulties.

Unsubsidized operators currently have about 700 ships active under U.S. flag. About 70 percent of this tonnage is in ships of World War II design or older. These ships will come to roughly the end of their competitive economic lifespans over the next few years. There is no orderly or comprehensive plan for their replacement, and the present state of the shipping market provides little incentive to the nonsubsidized owners to initiate replacement programs.

Our coastwise and intercoastal fleets which prior to World War II comprised the largest segment of the merchant marine, have declined nearly to extinction. The disappear-



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 86th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 106

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MAY 18, 1960

No. 91

Senate

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Lord God Omnipotent, Thou only art the help and hope of our distracted world in all the disasters in human relationships the wrath of men brings upon it.

Though people imagine a vain thing, Thou still art God, and Thy mercy endureth forever, in spite of all human denials and betrayals.

Make plain to our understanding that our legislative enactments and our economic adjustments in the realm of trade and commerce in themselves cannot bring social salvation, except as they clear the way for the spiritual undergirding without which we labor in vain and all our endeavors are as futile props against a decaying house that the Lord hath not made.

We ask it in the name of the One whose truth shall make us free. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 17, 1960, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. BARTLETT, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

- H.R. 6215. An act for the relief of Mrs. Cornelia Fales;
- H.R. 8606. An act for the relief of Katherine O. Conover;
- H.R. 9406. An act for the relief of William J. Huntsman;
- H.R. 9711. An act for the relief of Robert L. Stoermer;
- H.R. 11826. An act for the relief of Loren W. Willis; and
- H.R. 11827. An act for the relief of Maj. Howard L. Clark.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

- S. 684. An act for the relief of Gerald Degnan, William C. Williams, Harry Eakon, Jacob Beebe, Thorvald Ohnstad, Evan S. Henry, Henry Pitmatalik, D. LeRoy Kotila, Bernard Rock, Bud J. Carlson, Charles F. Curtis, and A. N. Dake;
- S. 2317. An act for the relief of Mary Alice Clements;
- S. 2523. An act for the relief of Harry L. Arkin;
- S. 2779. An act relating to the election under section 1372 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 by the Augusta Furniture Co., Inc., of Staunton, Va.; and
- S. J. Res. 166. Joint resolution authorizing the Architect of the Capitol to permit certain temporary and permanent construction work on the Capitol Grounds in connection with the erection of a building on privately owned property adjacent thereto.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

- H.R. 6215. An act for the relief of Mrs. Cornelia Fales;
- H.R. 8606. An act for the relief of Katherine O. Conover;
- H.R. 9406. An act for the relief of William J. Huntsman;
- H.R. 9711. An act for the relief of Robert L. Stoermer;
- H.R. 11826. An act for the relief of Loren W. Willis; and
- H.R. 11827. An act for the relief of Maj. Howard L. Clark.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour; and I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Judiciary Subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia and the Flood Control, Rivers, and Harbors Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

THE UNITED STATES AND FREE WORLD UNITY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the summit conference has collapsed, leaving in its wake confusion, discord, and a feeling of dismay in many quarters.

The fact that the conference accomplished nothing is not, in and of itself, the overriding factor which has left the people of the world with a deep feeling of anxiety. What is important is the manner in which an effort to negotiate was smashed before it had even started.

It is apparent that whatever the facts which were used to prevent discussion, there was a determination to prevent discussion. The spirit of Camp David has been replaced by a spirit of discord, and an uneasy world is groping its way into a future which, Mr. President, no one can see very clearly.

It goes without saying that the United States and the free world are going to have to reassess their position.

I do not believe there is any doubt as to the essential unity of this country. By that, I do not mean a generalized unity which covers everything, and therefore means nothing. I do mean unity on the specific points upon which all Americans—Republicans and Democrats alike—are in agreement. We earnestly hope that those who have openly proclaimed their opposition to freedom as a way of life now realize how deep that unity is.

The American people are determined to do whatever is necessary to preserve their freedom. They are not going to be panicked; they are not going to be di-

9741

vided; they are not going to be black-mailed.

The American people, I believe, are determined to maintain the strength that is necessary in order to survive in a world where a major power has set as its basic standard of right the issue of might.

The American people are determined that freemen shall not be surrendered to the untender mercies of dictators. I hope no one will be deceived into premature actions on the assumption that America lacks the will or the determination to resist.

Mr. President, there is another point of that unity which I think should be made very clear. It is that unity does not imply that we ignore mistakes or that we smother differences. What it does imply is that we shall treat errors as mistakes to be corrected, not as leverage to separate our Nation. It also implies that whatever may be our differences, we are united on the fundamental necessity of preserving our way of life, and of opposing tyranny over the minds and souls of men and women.

Mr. President, there will, of course—as I stated yesterday—be a cool and objective assessment of whatever mistakes have been made. That assessment will take place under conditions and circumstances which will contribute to the information of the American people and to the strengthening of our country. Under our system, Congress is a body which has great responsibilities; and I am convinced that the Members of Congress will continue to discharge their responsibility.

We shall have to determine whether there are changed conditions which affect the adequacy of our defenses. We shall have to determine whether we have provided adequately for the integrity of our executive agencies. We shall have to determine whether we have provided adequately for the coordination of our vast governmental structure.

There is no need to search for scapegoats, because we do not have time to indulge in partisanship. All of us, Republicans and Democrats alike, must be conscious of the fact that the only time we can afford is that whose utilization will contribute to the strength, the determination, and the prestige of these United States of America and the free world.

Mr. President, we are not going to be panicked by threats over Berlin or threats against our allies.

We are going to continue to operate through our established institutions, recognizing fully that only one man can speak for our country, and that he must have behind him the united strength of a determined people.

Mr. President, I wish to read into the Record a cablegram which late yesterday afternoon was dispatched to President Dwight D. Eisenhower. The cablegram was signed by the illustrious Speaker of the House of Representatives, Mr. Rayburn; the majority leader of the Senate, Mr. Johnson of Texas; the Democratic presidential nominee in 1956, the titular head of the Democratic Party, the Honorable Adlai E. Stevenson, former

Governor of Illinois; and the very able and distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Arkansas, Mr. Fulbright. The cablegram reads as follows:

The Honorable DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER, Embassy of the United States of America, Paris, France:

As leaders of the Democratic Party of the United States we earnestly urge you to convey to Premier Khrushchev the views of the opposition party in your country that he reconsider his suggestion for postponement of the summit meeting until after the national elections in this country.

We feel that total failure of the conference and increasing mistrust on both sides will be serious and deeply disturbing to the whole world.

All of the American people earnestly desire peace, an end to the arms race, and ever better relations between our countries. We ask you, as the leader of this Nation, to see that these views are conveyed to Mr. Khrushchev.

Mr. MANSEFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished majority leader for the speech he has just made, and also for his part in the sending, on yesterday, of the cablegram signed by himself, Speaker Rayburn, Mr. Adlai Stevenson, and Senator J. William Fulbright, before the summit conference collapsed. I look upon it as an answer to the time proposal made by Mr. Khrushchev, to the effect that he would be willing to consider another summit meeting 6 or 8 months hence. As these leaders of the opposition party—that is to say, the party in opposition to the present administration—made abundantly clear, in this country there will be no division based on what has happened at the summit; but there will be unity, because it is needed and because it is voluntarily given and asserted.

Mr. President, speaking of the summit meeting, the breakdown of the meeting at Paris calls for a reassessment in the field of diplomacy. Perhaps what has happened at Paris is, in a sense a blessing in disguise.

It may well bring about an end to summit meetings, which are mostly ceremonial, and have a tendency to provide a propaganda field day for the press, the radio, TV, and even for some of the countries concerned. It would be far better if we returned to quiet diplomacy based on conferences in private, good faith on the part of the negotiators, and real authority vested in our accredited Ambassadors by those constitutionally responsible. In this way the hard, dogged, and determined work which must be shown on any question leading up to a solution can be performed by those most knowledgeable in the affairs of the country or countries concerned. It can be done on a mutual basis, a give-and-take basis, and perhaps in this way marginal differences in the beginning can be accommodated, and, as time goes on, even larger problems discussed, and perhaps settled.

Summit meetings at best are too short on diplomacy, too long on pageantry, and too limited in time. If they are to be held, they should be held for the purpose of allowing the chiefs of state to put their final stamp of approval on

agreements which had already been reached at lower levels; and certainly not, as in this most recent summit meeting, for the purpose of downgrading and humiliating the chiefs of staff of the Western Powers, and most especially President Eisenhower.

Mr. President, the invitation to visit the Soviet Union extended by Mr. Khrushchev to the President of the United States has been withdrawn. I understand from the press, though, that President Eisenhower intends to visit Japan and Korea. I would hope that, in addition to those two countries, at that time he will find it possible to visit the Republic of the Philippines and the Republic of South Vietnam as well.

I would hope also that what has happened at the summit, the breakdown, will not be duplicated at Geneva, because there at the present time there are at least technically three conferences in being: first, a conference on banning nuclear tests; second, a conference on disarmament; and third, a conference on surprise attack, which I understand has been in suspension since December 1958.

I would hope devoutly that these three conferences would continue to the end that at least in these fields a modicum of peace and stability could be achieved for the people of the world.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, for the last few days I have given particular attention to the headlines and to the captions on the various columns expressing individual opinions as to what has been taking place in Paris. It constitutes something of a fantasy when one writes them all in a column, taking a good many pages, to see what a myriad viewpoint is expressed.

The comment of the majority leader comes as a refreshing note indeed in all this confusing complex, because it reasserts from the opposition party the unity of this country and its determination to stand behind the man who is endowed by the Constitution and charged by the Constitution with the conduct of our foreign policy. As he goes abroad to diplomatic battle, it may be a cheering happenstance that the ancient alphabet makers put the letter "U" ahead of the letter "V." I have always thought that "U" for unity must necessarily come ahead of "V" for victory, whether it be in battle or in diplomatic interchange. And so this note of unity is the kind of thing that energizes a national leader when he is thousands of miles from home, and it makes him feel that all of his troops, regardless of their political affiliations, are behind him; and I think I can say, for the President, to the majority leader and his associates, "Thanks for a refreshing message."

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, that is a splendid thing for the minority leader to say, and it was also fine for the majority leader and for the assistant majority leader to have said what they did.

What has happened in Paris is no real disaster for our beloved country. It has perhaps more than ever knit more closely together the people of the United States. We do not intend to lose our liberty. We will continue to work for a

ministrator concerning airman and aircraft certificates. Time and experience now have indicated that this provision does not provide for an adequate review of decisions of the Administrator. Under the provisions of the Federal Aviation Act, the Civil Aeronautics Board has the authority to hear an appeal from a civil airman with respect to whether or not the action against the individual was correct and proper under the terms of the rule established by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency. The Civil Aeronautics Board does not have the authority to take any decisive action with regard to correction of a faulty or unsound rule.

In practical operation, we have discovered that the rights of an individual pilot receive less consideration under the administration of the Federal Aviation Act than would be accorded the most common criminal in a court of law. Substantial and upright citizens of this country, who are active civil pilots, 380,000 by the last official count of the Federal Aviation Agency, are subject to being charged with a violation of the regulations under the present enforcement program of the Agency and thereafter stand guilty until they can prove their innocence. If a civil penalty compromise is offered by the Administrator when the pilot is accused, his only appeal is to the same Administrator who has made the charge against him. Thus, we find that the FAA Administrator who made the rule and who charged the pilot with violating the rule, also acts as the judge, jury, and prosecutor. Under these proceedings, the pilot stands guilty until he can prove his innocence. These proceedings violate every basic concept of Anglo-Saxon law and justice. The only alternative open to a pilot in these cases is to take his case to the Federal courts, wherein the legal costs may well exceed more than 10 times the cost of the compromise penalty offered by the FAA. Usually, the pilot will accept the charge of guilty for economic reasons, if no other. There is no assurance that even the Federal courts can afford the individual pilot relief, regardless of the costs.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator be given 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ENGLE. Judicial determinations to date indicate that the courts rely upon the expertise of the Administrator and their findings are based upon whether or not this Administrator, who has been given the power to make the rule and then act as judge, jury, and prosecutor—has acted with the law—Aviation Act of 1958—and the Administrative Procedure Act.

The pilot does have an avenue of appeal in cases where the FAA Administrator suspends or revokes his pilot's certificate. This appeal may be made to the Civil Aeronautics Board in accordance with the present act. However, we have found that this appeal, which

was granted by the Congress to protect the rights of individuals, can be circumvented by the FAA Administrator by the simple expedient of revising or amending any rule under which the Agency may receive adverse rulings from the Civil Aeronautics Board on actions against individual pilot certificates. The CAB is helpless in such cases.

The Federal Aviation Agency has been in existence for about a year and a half and in that time the Administrator has promulgated numerous rulings regulating flying and the conduct of pilots in the air. Some of these regulations have deprived pilots of their livelihood, even though the pilots may have had many years of experience and a good safety record. These regulations have been passed over a multitude of objections, with little factual evidence that they would contribute to safety in the air, and in the main, without a public hearing.

I do not believe that it was the intent of the Congress to authorize or encourage the Administrator to act in such an arbitrary manner, and I share the alarm of my colleagues who have had this matter brought to their attention by their constituents in the aviation industry. I have no quarrel with the need for immediate action by the Administrator of FAA on matters wherein there is a clear-cut and factual need for corrective action in the interest of safety in the air and to protect the public, but unfortunately, many of the arbitrary rulings that have been handed down by the Administrator under this power that we have given him, are not in areas where there is factual or clear-cut evidence to support his action in the interest of safety. In fact, there is very little evidence to indicate that many of his so-called safety rulings would have prevented any of the unfortunate accidents that have occurred in the past, or will make any significant contribution to safety in the future.

It is quite clear to me that the Administrator must be required to hold hearings on proposed rulings which do not require emergency exercise of his authority in the interest of safety. Only by following such procedure and obtaining full information from all of the valuable sources both within and outside of Government, can the Administrator arrive at reasonable and just rules which are necessary in the public interest. Failure to obtain full information through the medium of public hearings has resulted in actions by the Administrator which I consider arbitrary and unwarranted, and which have resulted in grave injustices whereby many capable and experienced pilots have been deprived of their flying privileges and their livelihood.

Aviation has become one of the great industries of the United States and I feel strongly that the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency must exercise his responsibilities in this great and growing industry in a reasonable and just manner. To do otherwise would be contrary to the declaration of policy stated in section 103 of the act wherein

the Administrator was charged by the Congress with "the promotion, encouragement, and development of civil aeronautics." Unless this matter is corrected and the Administrator discharges these responsibilities in a reasonable and just manner, we will see our very valuable national asset—our aviation industry—wither on the vine under the burden of Government oppression. We have heard on many occasions that the Federal Aviation Agency program is being carried on with utmost vigor in the interest of public safety. I wish to commend the Agency for its forthright interest in safety, but I also wish to remark that the individual who is most concerned with the safety of an aircraft is the pilot who is in the front of that aircraft and may pay with his life for any major violation of basic safety concepts. These pilots are vitally interested in flight safety and have contributed much to develop this great national asset. Unfortunately, these people are operating under a severe handicap in the form of procedures imposed upon them by the Administrator of FAA and grave injustice is being done in many cases wherein the individual is denied the same due process of law that is the very foundation of our American way of life.

No one human being is infallible, yet we have vested in one man this vast authority over an entire industry. In a field so vital, progressive and complex as the aviation industry, a safeguard must be provided to insure reasonable and proper exercise of this all-powerful authority. For this reason, I consider it of utmost importance that the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 be amended so as to grant the Civil Aeronautics Board certain review authority over the actions of the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency. It is quite clear now that we have placed too much power in the hands of a single individual and that a safeguard must be provided by the Congress to protect the rights of our citizens in this vital business. Without this safeguard, many grave injustices will be imposed upon law abiding and upright citizens and this dynamic economic resource will not continue to develop as it should with the proper encouragement of the Federal Government.

So, Mr. President, I offer for introduction and appropriate reference two bills, first a bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to give the Civil Aeronautics Board certain review authority over the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, and second, a bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 with respect to the authority of the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency over airman's certificates.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of these bills—and they are short—be printed in the Record immediately following my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bills will be printed in the Record.

The bills, introduced by Mr. ENGLE, were received, read twice by their titles, referred to the Committee on Interstate

1960

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

9743

just peace. I think, too, it is fair to say that Khrushchev's imprecations have knit together more closely the peoples of the free world.

What has been said here today has been echoed in parliaments all around the globe. I read with the greatest of interest the moving comments of the Prime Minister of the Flemish people to the Holland Parliament, in which he went on to say that so long as free people stand together, freedom can well be secured.

I congratulate my colleague on the other side of the aisle, and my Republican leader, as well.

RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF ERIE COUNTY, N.Y.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Erie County, N.Y., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide medical care for elderly citizens.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the agricultural productivity of America has resulted in an abundance of healthful and nutritious foods; and

Whereas medical science has made tremendous progress in the development of surgical methods and drugs which strengthen and prolong life; and

Whereas as a result we can all look forward to a healthier and longer life; and

Whereas since life expectancy has increased, we have in our midst a large number of senior citizens without whose efforts our recent situation would not be possible; and

Whereas the cost and frequency of medical care increases as a person reaches the age of 65 which is the mandatory retirement age for most persons; and

Whereas medical aid to senior citizens could be financed in a manner similar to or in conjunction with social security by spreading the cost over the productive years in which a person is gainfully employed; and

Whereas the benefits of medical aid to senior citizens would far outweigh the very small cost to each individual: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this honorable Board go on record as strongly in favor of medical aid to senior citizens.

Attest:

LEON HINKLEY,
Deputy Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of Erie County

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 2770. A bill for the relief of Borinquen Home Corporation (Rept. No. 1388).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, without amendment:

S. 3429. A bill to amend section 216(b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to permit the appointment of U.S. nationals to the Merchant Marine Academy (Rept. No. 1391).

By Mr. BARTLETT, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with an amendment:

S. 3018. A bill to authorize the Maritime Administration to make advances on Government insured ship mortgages (Rept. No. 1389).

REPORT ENTITLED "TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT"—INDIVIDUAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 1390)

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, pursuant to Senate Resolution 56, as extended, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I submit a report entitled "Trading with the Enemy Act," together with individual views of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report, together with the individual views, be printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from South Carolina.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session.

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Ray M. Sundeen, and sundry other persons, for permanent appointment in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MURRAY (by request):

S. 3581. A bill to permit the Secretary of the Interior to revoke in whole or in part the school and agency farm reserve on the Lac du Flambeau Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S. 3562. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Hungarian Reformed Federation of America," approved March 2, 1907, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ENGLE:

S. 3563. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to give the Civil Aeronautics Board certain review authority over the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency; and

S. 3564. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 with respect to the authority of the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency over airman's certificates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. ENGLE when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 3565. A bill for the relief of Alpo Franssila Crane; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FONG:

S. 3566. A bill for the relief of Yun Fun Cheng Chan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS:

S. 3567. A bill providing for the disposition of judgment funds of the Omaha Tribe of Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 3568. A bill to establish a program of financial and technical assistance designed to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment in economically depressed areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself, Mr. BUSH, Mr. SEALL, Mr. KEATING, Mr. MORTON and Mr. JAVITS):

S. 3569. A bill to assist areas to develop and maintain stable and diversified economies by a program of financial and technical assistance and otherwise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. COOPER (for himself, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. MORSE, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. CRUENING, Mr. MCNAMARA, and Mr. CLARK):

S. 3570. A bill to provide for the humane treatment of animals used in experiment and tests by recipients of grants from the United States and by agencies and instrumentalities of the U.S. Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. COOPER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S.J. Res. 195. Joint resolution providing for the designation of 1960 as Sinclair Lewis Year; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

TREATMENT OF LICENSED PILOTS BY FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I continue to be distressed at what I feel to be arbitrary actions by the Federal Aviation Agency in the matter of treatment of licensed civil pilots under the authority granted to the FAA Administrator by the Congress in the Federal Aviation Act of 1958. Senators may recall the tragic series of mid-air collisions that prompted a review of the then existing Civil Air Regulations and resulted in enactment by the 85th Congress of the Federal Aviation Act, which placed extraordinary powers in the hands of a single man—the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency. At that time, I expressed concern with regard to the vast power that would be lodged in one individual, but the act was passed most expeditiously in the overall interests of safety. It may be recalled that testimony before the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee indicated the desire of the aviation industry to cooperate in the legislative overhaul of our Civil Air Regulations. Misgivings were voiced by aviation leaders concerning certain aspects of the appeal provisions of the Federal Aviation Act and the thought was expressed that recourse to the Congress would be utilized if a reasonable period of operation indicated that some modification or amendment of the act was required.

When the act of 1958 was put in final form and passed by the Congress, a provision was included in section 609 for appeal to the Civil Aeronautics Board with regard to rulings by the FAA Ad-

9794

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 18

list of the documented cases of spying by Communist agents on American soil.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOVIET ESPIONAGE—A SELECTED LIST OF REPORTED CASES OF SOVIET ESPIONAGE IN THE UNITED STATES AND OTHER WESTERN ALIGNED NATIONS

(NOTE.—Those instances involving diplomatic personnel are indicated by "Diplomatic.")

May 1, 1946: Allan Nunn May, a British scientist who worked on atomic energy in Canada, was sentenced to 10 years in prison by a British court. May was part of the Soviet espionage ring in Canada which was exposed by Igor Gouzenko, a code clerk in the Soviet Embassy in Ottawa, who broke with the Russians and sought political asylum. Seventeen Soviet Embassy officials charged with espionage have been expelled from Canada. Eight Canadian citizens, including a member of Parliament, were convicted of espionage and given various jail sentences.

June 30, 1949: Judith Coplon was convicted of taking Justice Department secrets and using them to aid Russia. She was sentenced to from 40 months to 10 years in prison. On January 28, 1952, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that she was entitled to a new trial because the Government used illegal wiretap evidence. She was never retried on this charge.

October 31, 1949 (diplomatic): Dr. Erwin Munk and a clerk named Horvat of the Czech Embassy in Washington were declared persona non grata.

January 25, 1950: Alger Hiss found guilty of lying to a grand jury in 1948 when he declared that he had never given any secret State Department documents to Whittaker Chambers, who then passed them on to the Soviet Union. He was sentenced to 5 years in prison.

March 1, 1950: Klaus Fuchs was sentenced by a British court to 14 years imprisonment after pleading guilty to giving atomic secrets to Russia.

March 9, 1950: Judith Coplon, in her second trial, was found guilty of conspiracy to commit espionage and was sentenced to 15 years in prison. On December 5, 1950, the U.S. Court of Appeals reversed the conviction on the grounds of illegal arrest and use of illegal wiretap evidence. The Supreme Court refused to review the case on January 28, 1952.

March 9, 1950 (diplomatic): Valetin A. Gubitchev, a United Nations employee, was found guilty as Judith Coplon's codefendant. He was sentenced to 15 years' imprisonment but the sentence was suspended on condition he leave the United States. Gubitchev sailed for Poland on March 20th.

April 15, 1950: Air Force Cpl. Gustav Mueller was convicted of attempting to give U.S. military secrets to Russia. He was sentenced to 5 years at hard labor.

September 22, 1950: Alfred D. Slack pleaded guilty to giving samples of a secret explosive to Harry Gold and was sentenced to 15 years in prison.

November 22, 1950: Abraham Brothman was convicted of conspiring to mislead a grand jury (which was investigating espionage) and of influencing Harry Gold to give false statements to the jury. He was sentenced to 7 years' imprisonment and fined \$15,000. In July, 1951, the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals upheld the 2-year sentence and \$10,000 fine for misleading a grand jury, but reversed the 5-year sentence and \$5,000 fine for influencing Gold.

November 22, 1950: Miriam Moskowitz was convicted (together with A. Brothman) of conspiring to mislead a grand jury and was sentenced to 2 years in prison and fined \$10,000.

December 9, 1950: Harry Gold pleaded guilty to transmitting atomic secrets to the Russians and received a 30-year prison sentence.

April 5, 1951: Julius and Ethel Rosenberg were sentenced to death for procuring and transmitting atom bomb secrets to Russia during and after the Second World War. They were both executed on June 19, 1953.

April 5, 1951: Morton Sobell was sentenced to 30 years in prison for giving nonatomic defense secrets to the Fuchs-Gold spy ring.

April 6, 1951: David Greenglass admitted to giving atomic data to the Fuchs-Gold ring while working as an Army technician at Los Alamos, N. Mex., and was sentenced to 15 years' imprisonment.

September 26, 1951 (diplomatic): Nikolai P. Orlov, the assistant naval secretary of the Soviet Embassy in Stockholm, was ordered to leave Sweden immediately in connection with the Andersson espionage case.

November 14, 1951: Ernest Hilding Andersson, a petty officer in the Swedish Navy, was sentenced to life imprisonment after being found guilty of gross espionage for the Soviet Union. Andersson admitted supplying the Russians with secret data on the Swedish Navy, coastal defense installations, and suitable invasion areas along the coast of northern Sweden. He named N. P. Orlov, Konstantin Vinogradov, a Soviet Embassy secretary, and Tass correspondent Victor Anissimov as his accomplices.

October 1952: Nikolai Skvartsov, a political officer in the U.N. Department of Security Council Affairs, was discharged after the State Department notified the U.N. that he had violated a U.S. law.

February 4, 1953: William Remington was found guilty of perjuring himself at his first trial in 1951 when he said he never gave any secret material of the War Production Board to Elizabeth Bentley, a self-styled Communist spy. He was sentenced to 3 years in prison.

February 25, 1953: Lev C. Pissarev, Tass correspondent, was deported from the Netherlands for spying after being arrested on December 23 in the act of receiving secret documents from a Dutch official who was co-operating with the police.

May 30, 1953 (diplomatic): Christache Zambeti, first secretary of the Rumanian Legation in Washington, was declared persona non grata for attempting to blackmail a U.S. citizen into espionage acts.

June 5, 1953: William Perl was sentenced to 5 years in prison for perjury for having told a grand jury in 1950 that he did not know atom spies Julius Rosenberg and Morton Sobell.

June 8, 1953: Air Force Staff Sgt. Giuseppe Cascio was convicted by court martial in Taegu, Korea, of conspiracy to give jet plane secrets to the Communists. He was given a 20-year jail sentence and a dishonorable discharge.

June 8, 1953: Kurt Ponger and Otto Verber were convicted of conspiracy to procure and transmit Army, Air Force, and aircraft plant data to the Soviet Union. They were sentenced to 5 to 15 years and 3½, to 10 years in prison, respectively.

June 8, 1953 (diplomatic): Yuri Novikov, second secretary of the Soviet Embassy, was named as a coconspirator in the Verber-Ponger indictment. He was then declared persona non grata by the U.S. Government and returned to the Soviet Union.

October 31, 1953: Pvt. Robert W. Dorey was sentenced to 15 years in prison after pleading guilty to fleeing to East Germany, then twice returning to the U.S. Zone with Soviet agents whom he guided around U.S. military installations.

February 3, 1954 (diplomatic): Igor A. Amosov, assistant naval attaché at the Soviet Embassy in Washington, was declared persona non grata and expelled for engaging in espionage.

February 3, 1954 (diplomatic): Alexander P. Kovalev, second secretary to the Soviet delegation to the United Nations was declared persona non grata and expelled for espionage activities.

May 29, 1954 (diplomatic): Leonid E. Pivnev, assistant air attaché in the Soviet Embassy in Washington, was declared persona non grata and expelled for engaging in espionage.

August 28, 1954: Nobunori Higurashi, a Japanese Foreign Office official, committed suicide after he had confessed to giving secret information to a Soviet spy ring. The central figure in the ring was Yuri A. Rastvorov, former member of the Soviet mission in Tokyo, who has been granted political asylum in the United States. Two other Foreign Office officials have also been implicated.

December 22, 1954 (diplomatic): Maj. Ludvik Sochor, Czech military attaché in Geneva, and two of his assistants were expelled from Switzerland for espionage.

September 14, 1955: An Australian Royal Commission on Soviet Espionage released its report. The commission, created after Vladimir Petrov, third secretary of the Soviet Embassy, sought asylum from the Russians on April 13, 1954, declared that two Soviet spy "apparatuses" had been functioning in Australia since 1943. At least 120 Australians, all of whom were Communists, assisted the Soviet spy rings but because of the Australian law on espionage and the admissibility of evidence no prosecutions were undertaken.

March 1, 1956 (diplomatic): Maj. Anatoli Kuznetsov, assistant military attaché of the Soviet Embassy in Teheran was expelled from Iran after being arrested with Iranian Air Force Warrant Officer Hussein Rejaei Tehrani who confessed to espionage.

June 14, 1956 (diplomatic): Col. Ivan A. Bubchikov, assistant military attaché of the Soviet Embassy in Washington, was declared persona non grata for "activities incompatible to his continued presence in this country."

July 13, 1956 (diplomatic): Gennadi Popov, the Soviet second secretary, was expelled from Canada for spying.

August 24, 1956 (diplomatic): Victor I. Petrov, a translator in the languages section on the U.N. Secretariat, was discharged from the United Nations after the U.S. delegation issued a statement saying that Petrov had sought to get "information vital to the security and defense of the United States."

August 29, 1956 (diplomatic): Rostislav Shapovalov, second secretary of the Soviet mission to the U.N., was requested to leave the United States after it was discovered that he exerted pressure on a Russian refugee in the United States to become a Soviet agent.

September 5, 1956 (diplomatic): Sweden expelled Peter Miroslavov for receiving secret data from Anatole Ericson and sent a formal protest to Moscow about its spy activities in that country.

October 5, 1956: Anatole Ericson, a radar instrument maker, was convicted of giving military secrets to Russia by a Swedish court and sentenced to 12 years at hard labor.

October 5, 1956: Jean Joseph Philip, a code clerk at the Budapest Legation in Paris, and Roger Dubois, Legation press attaché, were convicted in France of spying for the Hungarian Secret Service and were sentenced to imprisonment.

December 18, 1956 (diplomatic): Mate Vegh, former Hungarian second secretary, was expelled from Switzerland for spying.

January 14, 1957 (diplomatic): Maj. Yuri P. Krylov, assistant military attaché of the Soviet Embassy in Washington, was declared persona non grata for purchasing classified electronic equipment and attempting to purchase secret military information.

January 28, 1957 (diplomatic): Vassili M. Molev, a clerk attached to the Soviet Em-

MAY 18 1960

1960

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

9793

Prouty
Robertson
RussellSaltonstall
Scott
SmithSparkman
Stennis

NAYS—36

Allott
Bartlett
Beall
Bible
Cannon
Carroll
Case, N.J.
Case, S. Dak.
Chavez
Church
Curtis
DoddDouglas
Engle
Goldwater
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hruska
Humphrey
Jackson
Kuchel
LauscheLong, Hawaii
McGee
Magnuson
Mansfield
Moss
Murray
Pastore
Proxmire
Thurmond
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—26

Anderson
Bennett
Brunsdale
Butler
Capehart
Ervin
Frear
Fulbright
GreenHennings
Johnson, Tex.
Jordan
Kefauver
Kennedy
McCarthy
McNamara
Morse
O'MahoneyRandolph
Schoepel
Smathers
Symington
Talmadge
Wiley
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough

So the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to inquire, first, of the acting majority leader, about the program for tomorrow and also for the remainder of the week, insofar as it is possible for him to inform the Senate now.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in response to the question asked by the distinguished minority leader, I must admit that I do not have too much information available. But, as of now, it is the intention to have the Senate meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning, so that at about 12 o'clock it will be possible for Senators who desire to do so to make speeches on the retirement of our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

It is anticipated that we shall then bring up some printing resolutions and minor money resolutions out of the Committee on Rules and Administration. If possible, we may get to the Stella bill, a bill of some renown. If we do not get to it tomorrow, we should get to it within the next several days.

I hope within the next 10 minutes or so to have a more complete schedule to announce and to inform Senators whether we shall meet Friday or go over from Thursday until Monday.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I am concerned today about the fate of the supplemental air carriers industry in this country. After years of hearings the Civil Aeronautics Board, in January 1959, certificated and authorized supplemental air carriers, recognizing this unique and essential service as a necessary segment of the Nation's air transportation structure. Today the supplemental air carriers have a record of proven contribution in the framework of air travel, serving civilian passengers and cargo and as military carriers.

These airlines are unique in that they have never been nor are they now subsidized by the Federal Government. In addition to efficient, alert, and dependable day-to-day service supplied to the military, supplemental airlines were authorized to fly regular scheduled flights—10 flights per month—between

any 2 cities within the United States. Currently cities such as New York, Chicago, Miami, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Honolulu, Detroit, and Dallas are served with civilian business and tourist air travelers who have come to depend on the unique transportation need filled by the supplemental airlines.

It should also be noted, Mr. President, that much of the credit for holding the line on air transportation costs belongs to the pioneers of the supplemental air carrier industry who have contributed greatly to low-fare, air coach travel.

During a visit to the Supplemental Air Carrier Conference, a national trade association, I saw the system and facilities utilized to respond to the demands of the Defense Department for troop movement on an around-the-clock basis day after day. The services proved themselves able and responsible when activated by the armed services. Most important, perhaps, is the system of the supplemental air carrier industry in doing business with the military in such a fashion that it provides airlift ready to take on a military mission in a matter of hours if a national emergency should arise. We have had altogether too many illustrations of the deficiencies in our airlift potential and I am sure that the committees concerned with this legislation will bear me out in this statement. This is a time when we should be doing everything we can to increase our airlift capabilities rather than to harass and place obstacles before an industry which serves so useful and necessary functions for both civilians and military.

I am sure that Congress and friends of aviation everywhere were distressed at the news last month that the appellate court had upset the Civil Aeronautics Board's certification of these small pioneering airlines which have contributed so much toward our national defense and as a convenience for the traveling public.

I know, Mr. President, that the court held that the Civil Aeronautics Board had no legal means by which these carriers' important services could be certificated under the Federal Aviation Act, as the statute is now in effect, and the court pointed out that the problem is one which invites congressional action. In fact, it is my interpretation that the Congress would be remiss in its historic duty to further the cause of safe and dependable air travel if we failed to act on this problem. It may perhaps be only a technical change that is required in the law, which can be remedied by the Congress, but our failure to act will have a most serious and perhaps disastrous effect on peacetime air transportation and national security.

I hope, Mr. President, that my colleagues will recognize the necessity for coming to the immediate rescue of the supplemental airlines and enact legislation during this session which will preserve the certificates granted to the individual carriers of the industry during this critical time in our national defense airlift. I believe that after some 12 years of proven ability the very least that Congress can do is to make permanent that

which the governing agency—the Civil Aeronautics Board—has found to be so vitally in the public interest and in the interest of our national defense. I urge Members of the Senate, and particularly members of the committees directly affected in the study of this problem to give their most earnest and painstaking study to a problem that merits immediate attention.

REPORTED CASES OF SOVIET ESPIONAGE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, this week in Paris Mr. Khrushchev engaged in a global blasphemy by raising his right hand and swearing before the God in whom he does not believe that his hands were clean from the standpoint of international espionage.

To a man who started his services on the House Un-American Activities Committee back in the days when Martin Dies, of Texas, was its chairman, that event struck a familiar note with me, and I have obtained from the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress a list of over 65 Russian spy cases, documented in the history of the United States, beginning on May 1, 1946.

They include such famous cases as the Allan Nunn May case, that of a British scientist who was convicted for espionage, involving people in Canada.

The list includes the Judith Coplin case. She was convicted of taking Justice Department secrets and using them to aid Russia.

It includes the case of Alger Hiss, who was found guilty of lying to a grand jury in connection with his theft of State Department documents.

The list includes the case of Valetin A. Gubitchev, a United Nations employee who was found guilty as Judith Coplin's codefendant, and who was caught redhanded transferring American money for spy secrets to be delivered to the Russian Government, for whom he was then working.

The list includes the case of Harry Gold.

The list includes the case of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg, about whom nothing further need be said.

It includes the Morton Sobell case.

It includes the David Greenglass case.

It includes the case of William Remington, who was found guilty of perjuring himself at his first trial in 1951, when he said he never gave any secret material of the War Production Board to Russia.

It includes the case of Yuri Novikov, Secretary of the Soviet Embassy, named as a coconspirator in the Verber-Ponger indictment.

It includes the case of Igor A. Amosov, Assistant Naval Attaché at the Soviet Embassy in Washington.

The list goes on and on for more than 65 specific cases of spies serving Mr. Khrushchev, his predecessor, Mr. Stalin, and the Government of Russia, all having occurred within the territorial limitations of the United States.

I think the Record should show those cases, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the entire

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. In regard to the reference to what took place 100 years ago in the Republican convention, history has certainly recorded that the Republican Party made a wonderful choice in its nominating Abraham Lincoln for President, but I invite attention to the fact that at that time there was also a magnificent second choice whom the Republicans did not choose to call upon. That was William Henry Seward, who led in the balloting for two ballots and was overtaken by Lincoln on the third, but who lived on to be one of the great Secretaries of State in both Lincoln's and Johnson's Cabinets, and to consummate the purchase of Alaska, thus making a further great contribution to our Nation, even greater than those he had previously made as the Governor of New York State and as a Member of this body.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, to round out the historical aspects of the matter, the President-elect wisely chose as his running mate, if it was within his choice, a very redoubtable citizen, a great scholar, I suppose one of the greatest Latin scholars who ever came to the Congress. He came from Maine, and his name was Hannibal Hamlin. He was really a great citizen.

BIRTHDAYS OF SENATOR JAVITS AND SENATOR KEATING, OF NEW YORK

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I would like to have my friend the Senator from New York listen when I say that speaking of anniversaries, I would not let this day go by without observing that this is the anniversary of the birthday of the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. Interestingly enough, it is also the anniversary of the birthday of the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING]. Probably, never in the history of the Senate have there been two Senators from the same State who have had the same natal day. And so I offer my felicitations to my distinguished friends, Senator JAVITS and Senator KEATING.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to express my deep gratitude to my own leader. I understand the majority leader, when I was not in the Chamber earlier today, paid a tribute, on our birthday, to my colleague, Mr. KEATING, and to me. Mr. President, this is unusual, but it is a source of deep gratification to me. My colleague is not only a colleague, but also is a friend. We represent the most populous, and, in financial and industrial terms, the most powerful State in the Union. I should like to express to him my congratulations to him on his birthday, and to affirm our friendship and the gratification which I have in serving with a colleague in such close harness in the interests of so great a State.

Mr. President, it is a strange and fortuitous circumstance that Abraham Lincoln should have been nominated to

be President on this day 100 years ago. This only enhances the joys of the day for me, and I know it does also for my colleague, Mr. KEATING.

I have one other thought which I wish to share with my colleague from Illinois. We have had a bad international blow in the last day. I have thought about it a great deal today. One does think about things on one's birthday. Perhaps this is a day to gain strength for what must be the integration of the free world and its greater devotion to freedom. I wish to state to my own leader the gratification which I have in being able to stand in the U.S. Senate and to fight for the causes which are conducive to that objective.

I am very grateful to my colleague for his affection and the warmth of his greeting.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to join with the distinguished minority leader in extending congratulations to New York's two famous sons. I believe both the Senator from Illinois and I served with them in the House of Representatives, and got to know them and to recognize their value at that time.

It is, of course, a sad occasion, as we get older to note each passing birthday. There is nothing we can do about it.

It is a pleasure to have the opportunity to join with the distinguished Senator from Illinois in honoring two great members of his party, who have made many contributions to the betterment and to the welfare of our country in both Houses of the Congress.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I, too, desire to extend my most heartfelt congratulations to both the able Senators from New York. We have had occasion to listen to eloquence from the heart of our colleague, the senior Senator [Mr. JAVITS] but it is far more than his eloquence; it is, in addition, his ability and leadership in so many public causes in the Senate, which mellow the hearts of the rest of us on this occasion—it is his own friendship for his friends.

I should like to say to JACK, and in absentia to his colleague, KEN, that all of us in the Senate join in the congratulations of which our leader on the Republican side so eloquently spoke and of which earlier today the leader of the Democratic side spoke. If I may be pardoned for saying so, Mr. President, I am glad both these stalwart Senators sit on this side of the aisle.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I also join with my colleagues in extending congratulations and good wishes to our colleagues from New York, the distinguished senior Senator [Mr. JAVITS] and the distinguished junior Senator [Mr. KEATING].

We know that both of these men are men of fine intelligence, with wonderful abilities and great capacities. We know also that they are men of great integrity, humane spirit and heart. They are splendid representatives of a great State.

I know that all of us have treasured—as I have particularly treasured—our associations and friendship with these two colleagues.

Mr. President, I wish to join also with the minority leader, the Senator from New York, and others, in noting that this is the 100th anniversary of the nomination of Abraham Lincoln to be President of the United States. One hundred years ago our country faced a great problem, the problem of whether this country would remain united. We survived a great war, a tragic war. That war, bad as it was, bound our country together.

I do not wish to draw any analogies which may not be quite correct, but I think it can be said that today we are in a very difficult situation. Our country faces great problems as we look ahead. One of the factors which has been happy and helpful in the last few days has been the support given to the President of the United States at the summit.

I hope and believe that that support will continue and that our country will be unified as we look ahead.

The summit was a test of the intentions of the Soviet Union and Mr. Khrushchev. It may be also a test of the determination of the people of the United States to take whatever measures are necessary to defend our security and their determination to pursue whatever measures may be necessary toward the solution of the issues which have brought about the differences between the United States and the Soviet Union, and also our determination to pursue disarmament continuously. All of those things may eventually and ultimately bring peace to our country and to the world. But I do wish to say that there is some similarity between the conditions we face today and those faced by the country 100 years ago.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, may I add to the words of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] my sincere congratulations to both Senators from New York on this very unusual and happy occasion of their birthdays. The junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] a while ago spoke almost in a sad tone about the passing of the years and the addition of years to his age. I take from my own memory a quotation which might serve to hearten him. I believe it was Tennyson who said:

Yet I doubt not through the ages one increasing purpose runs,
And the thoughts of men are widen'd by the process of the suns.

So in achieving age, as we all come to our birthdays each year, we may feel the weight of years, but I am sure my friends will find heart in the words of Tennyson.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, as a native of New York State I am happy to join in the tributes initiated by the distinguished minority leader in behalf of the two Senators from New York who are celebrating their birthdays today. I had a very happy contact and experience with them before I became a Member of the Senate, which was several years ago when, as a so-called "Tennessee plan" Senator, I was elected by the people of Alaska to come to Washington to promote the cause of Alaskan statehood. The argument was advanced by some Members of the Senate and some Mem-

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

9795

1960

bassy in Washington, was declared persona non grata by the State Department. He was later named as a coconspirator in the indictment of the Sobles' spy ring.

February 27, 1957 (diplomatic): The Danish Government expelled Soviet Lt. Comdr. Mikhail Ruditchev, assistant naval attaché of the Soviet Embassy, on the grounds that he was attempting to obtain secret military information.

March 12, 1957: A Swedish court sentenced Bedros Zartaryan, a Turkish engineer employed by a firm which was building Swedish naval and air bases, to 10 years at hard labor for grand espionage for the Soviet Union.

March 16, 1957 (diplomatic): Jiri Stejskal, third secretary of the Czechoslovak Legation in Vienna, was expelled from Austria for attempting to bribe a police official to carry out espionage work.

April 24, 1957: Robert Folke Damstedt, assistant secretary of the Swedish Atomic Energy Commission, was convicted of stealing secret papers, and was sentenced to 5 years in prison.

May 7, 1957: Three men were sentenced to death in Greece after being convicted of treason and espionage for the Soviet Union. Another man was given a life sentence, and five other persons were given lesser terms.

July 23, 1957: West German security officials broke a Communist spy ring headquartered in a Bonn hotel.

August 9, 1957: Myra Soble, wife of Jack Soble, was sentenced to 5½ years in prison after pleading guilty to charges of espionage.

August 9, 1957: Jacob Albam was sentenced to 5½ years in prison after pleading guilty to espionage in behalf of the Soviet Union as a member of the Soble spy ring.

September 5, 1957: A former Japanese Foreign Office official was fined and sentenced to prison for selling secrets to a Soviet agent.

September 20, 1957: U.S. Air Force Capt. George French was convicted and sentenced to life imprisonment for attempting to sell military secrets to the Soviet Union.

September 25, 1957: An Austrian customs service official was arrested for espionage and confessed that he turned information over to Czech Communist agents.

October 8, 1957: Jack Soble was sentenced to 7 years in prison after pleading guilty to heading a spy ring for the Soviet Union.

November 1957: German officials reveal that a former first lieutenant in the West German Air Force has been convicted of espionage.

November 15, 1957: Col. Rudolf I. Abel, a Soviet intelligence officer, was sentenced to 30 years in prison and fined \$3,000 for passing U.S. defense and atomic secrets to Russia.

February 21, 1958: M. Sgt. Roy A. Rhodes was convicted by a U.S. Army court martial of conspiring to deliver U.S. secrets to the Soviet Union and was sentenced to 5 years imprisonment at hard labor and was dishonorably discharged.

May 19, 1958 (diplomatic): Aleksandr Solovoyev, assistant military attaché of the Soviet Embassy in Rome, after being detained on charges of espionage was asked to leave Italy.

June 7, 1958 (diplomatic): Nikolai I. Kurochkin, third secretary of the Soviet Embassy in Washington, was declared persona non grata for the improper procurement of U.S. Army manuals and other materials.

July 18, 1958: Brian Linney, an engineer, was sentenced to 14 years imprisonment by a British court for selling secret information to Col. Oldrich Fribyl, a former Czech military attaché in England.

November 20, 1958: Mark Zborowski was convicted of perjury in denying to a Federal grand jury investigating espionage that he had known Jack Soble. He was sentenced to 5 years in prison.

November 20, 1958: Lt. Hans Berli was sentenced by a Swiss military court to 4

years hard labor for giving classified military secrets to Czech agents.

February 21, 1959: Einar Bleckinberg, a former Danish diplomat, was sentenced in Copenhagen to 8 years in prison for spying on behalf of Communist Poland.

January 30, 1960: Horst Ludwig and Fritz Briesemeister were sentenced by a West German court to 4 and 5 years at hard labor, respectively, for treason. Two other defendants, Werner Jaeger and his wife Hanni, were sentenced to 3 years and 18 months.

April 1, 1960: Anthony M. Wright, a former Royal Air Force officer, was found guilty in London of having given military information to Russia and was sentenced to 3 years in prison.

May 11, 1960 (diplomatic): The Swiss Government arrested and expelled two Soviet Embassy officials for attempting to collect secret information on Swiss army installations and U.S. rocket bases in West Germany.

May 23, 1960: U.S. News & World Report (p. 54) described Communist espionage in West Germany as follows:

"Last year, in West Germany alone, 2,787 Communist spies were caught. * * * East Germany sent most of them * * * but 264 were from Russia, 114 from Poland, 63 from Czechoslovakia, 11 from Rumania, 8 from Hungary and 2 from Bulgaria.

"During the first 4 months of this year, 820 more Communist agents were arrested, including 691 from East Germany, 72 from Russia. Yet only a fraction of all spies sent from the Soviet block to West Germany are caught.

"The current estimate is that 17,000 Communist spies are operating in West Germany. * * * Red agents also make West Berlin the kidnapping center of the world. Since the war they have tried 340 kidnappings, succeeded in 255.

"West German estimates of 17,000 active agents do not include either the silent group (Polish, Czech and Rumanian spies posing as refugees) or the 35,000 members of the outlawed West German Communist Party.

"Over the years, more than 15,000 Red agents have been arrested in West Germany. Of these, fewer than 2,000 have been convicted. Many were let off because they confessed, voluntarily, not long after they entered West Germany. Others showed they were coerced into spying by Red threats to their families."

Sources: Facts of File; New York Times; U.S. Congress, House Un-American Activities Committee, "Patterns of Communist Espionage," 86th Cong., 1st sess. H. Doc. No. 119 January 1959, 81 pp.; U.S. Department of State; Washington Post and Times Herald.

CORRECTIONS OF THE RECORD

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to correct the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 16, 1960, at page 9605, in the third column, in the eighth line from the bottom. The word "peak" should be "pack."

On page 9606, in the last line in the fifth paragraph, the word "will" has been repeated. It appears twice in the sentence. One of the words "will" should be deleted.

Also, in the RECORD of May 17, 1960, on page 9671, in inserting a letter from Mary Lee Council, administrative assistant to the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the printer inadvertently printed the second page which was on the back of the letter. This was an intrusion in printing the letter. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that when the permanent RECORD is printed the second portion, dealing with the Eklutna hydroelectric project,

be deleted, since it has no place in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The corrections will be made.

ANNIVERSARY OF NOMINATION OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN TO BE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I do not want this day to pass without observing that 100 years ago today Abraham Lincoln was nominated, in a great structure in Chicago known as The Wigwam, as the Republican candidate for the Presidency of the United States.

I have read a good many accounts as to what happened at that convention, and particularly those of a New York reporter named Murat Halstead, I think it is one of the most fascinating bits of reporting I have ever seen.

Abraham Lincoln was 51 years old when he was nominated on May 18, 100 years ago today.

I think it was one of the statesmen from New York, Mr. William M. Evarts, who made a seconding speech, who used a phrase or two which were not only interesting, but very applicable. He spoke about, "for the suffrages of the whole country." That is an interesting phrase. It has been echoed by the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], when they have spoken of unity. Unity means speaking for the whole country. That becomes an interesting echo from over a century of time.

Also in the speech Mr. Evarts used the phrase, in presenting the name of Mr. Lincoln, that he was nominating him to be "the Chief Magistrate of the American Union." There is a rounded sound about the expression, "Chief Magistrate of the American Union." This is a Union. It is American. There is a Chief Magistrate. His name is Dwight David Eisenhower. I glory in how he has spoken for the American Union under difficult and challenging circumstances.

I wish to add one squib from the Great Emancipator, Abraham Lincoln, because he had a dedication of spirit to the cause of peace precisely like that of the present President of the United States. On one occasion Lincoln said:

The man does not live who is more devoted to peace than I am. None who would do more to preserve it. But it may be necessary to put the foot down firmly.

So our President is equally dedicated to the cause of peace, and with that same devotion and that same firmness of spirit he has put his foot down, and in so doing merited the applause of our people.

I think I am at liberty to say that the President will return to the Nation's Capital in midafternoon of Friday of this week. I hope that all the citizenry who are available and so disposed will be able to journey to Andrews Field and to greet the President as he returns to his own country.

MAY 19 1960

9888

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 19

are able to offer their art in appropriate and adequate surroundings.

By contrast, Washington, probably alone among the great capitals of the world, has no existing adequate facility for the presentation of opera and other forms of the performing arts.

The Belasco Theater, originally known as the Lafayette Square Opera House, can be restored to its former beauty, elegance, and utility, and it would certainly seem that a country which has spent tens of millions of dollars restoring foreign opera houses and other public buildings abroad could afford the small expenditure required to put the old Lafayette Square Opera House back into a proper and usable condition.

It may even be that in the immediate future we will have a President who will take pride in, and derive great pleasure from, being able to take a state guest across the park to a lovely opera house for an evening of ballet or opera or for a recital by some great American artist.

Not long ago a group which wished to exhibit the work of student artists of a foreign country had to take their exhibit to a little public library on upper Connecticut Avenue, because Washington lacked a building in which such exhibits could be held.

The American Art League, one of the numerous groups combining their efforts within the organism of the Citizens Committee to Save Lafayette Square, has pointed out that either the old Dolly Madison House or the Benjamin Taylor House would serve ideally for exactly such purposes.

With organizations representing millions of citizens—national organizations such as the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the National Federation of Music Clubs, and the American National Theater and Academy, and such local entities as the D.C. Recreation Department, the Children's Theater of Washington, the Washington Ballet Guild and others—pleading for sympathetic understanding of the wisdom of saving the buildings and the atmosphere of Lafayette Square, we of the citizens committee feel that in coordinating and sparking these efforts we at least are not bringing "a little" effort to bear.

We have been heartened by a promise of public hearings before the Senate Public Works Committee and by pledges of assistance from many enlightened Members of Congress. However, this is a problem on which much additional support is needed and your readers are urged to assist where they think they can help.

CARL LEVIN,
Chairman, Citizens Committee To Save
Lafayette Square.

ACTIVITIES OF CYRUS EATON

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, among this morning's bulletins from Paris was the story that Cyrus Eaton, a well-known American apologist for world communism, flew to Paris last night and held a conference with Khrushchev at the airport before the departure of the Kremlin dictator.

This is the latest of many incidents in which Mr. Eaton has meddled in the conduct of American foreign policy through personal meetings with officials of foreign governments. Mr. Eaton is only one of a growing number of private citizens who are making a fad out of Mecca-like pilgrimages to the Kremlin, constituting themselves as messengers from the United States to Khrushchev and from Khrushchev to the United States, and, in general, involving themselves in the worldwide propaganda operation of the Communist movement.

For the benefit of Eaton and others, I quote the key provision of the Logan Act which was passed in 1799:

Any citizen of the United States, wherever he may be, who, without authority carries on any correspondence or intercourse with any foreign government or any officer or agent thereof, with intent to influence the measures or conduct of any foreign government or of any officer or agent thereof, in relation to any disputes or controversies with the United States, or to defeat the measures of the United States, shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than 3 years, or both.

Cyrus Eaton is a materialistic, meddlesome, evil old man, who has been a useful tool of the Communist movement. He has made a habit of exchanging visits and gifts with Communist leaders. He has made a practice of criticizing the United States in Russia and praising Russia in the United States.

He is the object of continuing Communist accolades and awards, the latest being the Lenin Peace Prize.

It is in his statements that the best picture of Eaton himself emerges. I wish to quote for the RECORD what Mr. Eaton has said about the United States of America. On one occasion he said:

The scientist is conscious that the FBI is breathing down the back of his neck all the time, scaring him * * * we have even praised the FBI for violating the rights of freemen. But if you were to take the police forces of the cities and of the countries and of the State and the governmental agencies and add them up, Hitler in his prime, through the Gestapo, never had any such extensive spy organization as we have in this country today.

He accused Secretary Dulles, the Pentagon generals, and American politicians in general of "relentlessly driving us to war." He has said that American officials do not represent the American people—this is interesting—whereas in the Soviet Union the government speaks in the name of all the people. He has said: "There is more spirit of war in the United States than in any other country in the world and it's dangerous."

He has publicly urged Canada to "completely disassociate itself from America's stubborn attitude in foreign affairs." If he has said in his many private conversations with Canadian officials what he said in this public meeting, then he has violated the express provision of the Logan Act and should be prosecuted.

So I direct the attention of the Attorney General of the United States to what Mr. Eaton has done.

Mr. Eaton has publicly praised Khrushchev's integrity, his popularity, his ability, his sense of humor, his honesty and his desire for peace. He described the completely phony disarmament plan Khrushchev announced to the United Nations as the "most statesmanlike utterance in my lifetime."

During questioning before the National Press Club in Washington, D.C., he said that Russia doesn't really mean to communize the world; that Dr. Zhivago was suppressed because the fanatical young people of the Soviet Union cannot bear any criticism of their beloved government; that the Russian massacre

of Hungarian patriots was no different from our sending troops to Lebanon."

This is a man in the United States who is comparing what we did in Lebanon to the butchery of the Hungarian patriots by Khrushchev.

I say again that I urge the Attorney General to keep a special eye on Mr. Eaton and whenever he violates the letter of the Logan Act, as he has so frequently violated its spirit, the Government of the United States should move promptly against him and against all others who unlawfully interfere with the conduct of American foreign policy.

I hope the Attorney General will carry out his duty. It is time we put an end to such activity in this country.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Connecticut that he has brought to our attention a very pertinent and important factor in present-day American politics in its broadest sense. I think the Senator has done a service today by the very vigorous remarks he has made.

The strange aberrations of this man Eaton are not understandable to most of us. This incident serves only to illustrate how far the tolerance of the American people goes in the field of freedom of speech. We have tolerated the understandable conduct and understandable statements of this man simply because this is America, and we respect the right of free speech. However, as the Senator has pointed out, there is a limit, so far as the public good is concerned and so far as the public weal is concerned. There is a limit to so-called freedom. When freedom becomes license we have always recognized that it must be curbed. It must be curbed sensibly and unemotionally.

I congratulate the Senator on his statement. I think this is a matter to which we should pay more attention in the future than we have in the past. The peculiar mental gyrations of this man Eaton, who apparently has great affection for the Communist system and apparently has great admiration for the autocracy and dictatorship or Russia, are not understandable. We should pay more attention to his utterances, because he happens to be a man of wealth, which fact enables him to indulge in publicity of this kind. It can do nothing, and has done nothing, but bring about very unfortunate difficulties for the United States.

One might go a little farther. Although I am not particularly charmed with this kind of an attitude, one might say, as has been said a few times in the past, when people do not seem to like the United States, want to tear down what we have done, and seem to love other systems, "Why do you not go there to live? Why do you not join the system for which you seem to have such great admiration, and simply abandon the citizenship which you do not seem to appreciate and the privileges which you do not seem to appreciate?"

I congratulate the Senator.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. DODD. I thank the Senator for his kind remarks. I point out that this

1960

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

9887

CRUCIAL VOTES IN CONGRESS

Question. Have there been some occasions when the opposition party would have preferred you to be absent on some of those ties, too?

Answer. That is certainly true because the eight tie votes in which I did participate were on important issues. You may remember that I broke the 47-47 tie on whether or not the Senate would approve a massive Federal-aid-to-education bill which would have made teachers' salaries a Federal responsibility. My breaking of the tie on that vote was considered a significant step, and I did not take it hastily.

Question. Don't you usually know in advance when some important issue is going to come up that might result in a tie?

Answer. Exactly. This is another reason why the possibility of a tie vote should not keep the Vice President from taking other assignments. The work of the Senate is generally so planned that you do not have votes called on the spur of the moment. Generally speaking, votes in the Senate are taken at specified times, particularly on critical issues.

Question. Is most of the work that you do for the executive branch in Washington itself, rather than out of town?

Answer. Yes; except when a trip abroad is involved. However, good-will trips are generally scheduled for congressional recesses or for periods when we do not expect any legislation. Otherwise, I am in Washington. I may be at the White House, for example, and I might point out that, at the White House, I am exactly 7 minutes—I know exactly how long it takes—from the Senate floor. So, if a vote should occur while I am at the White House, I am always able to get there in time to vote.

Question. In this rather intimate official relationship with the President for the last 7 years, it is presumed you have gotten to know each other pretty well. How would you describe your personal relations with the President?

Answer. Why, I would say that, thanks to him, those relations have been friendly, and certainly very memorable as far as I am concerned. I have been able to see how he reacts in handling difficult problems—problems like Lebanon, and Quemoy and Matsu, for example. There is nothing that quite takes the place of witnessing firsthand the making of great decisions.

WHEN A CRISIS ARISES

Question. Would you say that in crises Mr. Eisenhower is any different from what he is in the normal routine of everyday work?

Answer. I think everyone is different in a crisis. In the case of the President, what impresses me the most is his complete objectivity and impersonal approach to a crisis. You can describe it as coolness in a crisis, but simply saying that he is cool in a crisis does not adequately describe his attitude. In fact, those who have seen him, as I have, when he has made important decisions, get the impression that here is a man who is carefully weighing all the pros and cons of a particular course of action, without thinking at all about the effect that such action may have on his personal popularity—thinking only of what he believes is in the best interests of the country. And, most important, by watching him in these moments of crisis I was impressed by the fact that the hotter the discussion became, the cooler he became. This is probably one of the greatest lessons that I have learned while working under the President and with him during the past 7 years.

There is one other thing I might say in this connection which I think is important: Once he makes a decision, it is made. He does not continue to worry about it and to second-guess it. This, I think, also is important in leadership.

No. 92—3

Question. What is your feeling as you watch the President? Is the Presidency itself something toward which there is a sense of awe and perhaps of great reverence?

Answer. Strangely enough, as you were stating that question the words "awe" and "reverence" were exactly the ones that came into my mind. Whenever I see the President making a tough decision I recognize how easy, by comparison, my responsibilities are. Another thing that is very impressive about the President is that, no matter how much he may have on his mind, he seldom gives the impression of carrying the world on his shoulders. He has the ability to keep a relaxed mind when he makes the important decisions. Some men, when they have tough decisions, inevitably tense up right in front of your eyes. I have seldom seen the President give that impression, if ever.

THIRTY-THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF LINDBERGH'S SOLO FLIGHT ACROSS THE ATLANTIC OCEAN

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, 33 years ago tomorrow the world was electrified by a singular act of courage which stirred the imagination of mankind and signified the entrance into a new era. I refer to the first flight across the Atlantic Ocean by Charles A. Lindbergh.

Since that hour of triumph, Colonel Lindbergh has passed through many fiery trials. He has been visited alike by success and disappointment, by tragedy and achievement.

Last Sunday's issue of This Week magazine supplement featured a brief but moving article by Lindbergh, a statement reflecting the insight and experience of an unusual life. It is an eloquent plea for a rejection of the materialistic philosophy by the free world and for subordination of politics and science to the aims of a philosophy based on eternal moral truths.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHALLENGE

(By Charles A. Lindbergh)

I grew up as a disciple of science. I know its fascination. I have felt the godlike power man derives from his machines—the strength of a thousand horses at one's fingertips; the conquest of distance through mercurial speed; the immortal viewpoint of the higher air. I have sensed the harmony of muscle, mind, and mechanism which gives the illusion of life to substance until levers move with thought as hand or foot, until the rhythm of an engine is geared to the beat of one's own heart, and wing in turning flight seems an extension of one's own body.

Now, I have lived to experience the early results of scientific materialism. I have watched men turn into human cogs in the factories they believed would enrich their lives. I have watched pride of workmanship leave and human character decline as efficiency of production lines increased. I have seen the lifesaving miracles of medicine perverted toward the murderous ends of biological warfare. I have seen the science I worshiped, and the aircraft I loved, destroying the civilization I expected them to serve, and which I thought as permanent as earth itself. In memory, the vision of my mailplane boring northward over moonlit clouds is now mingled with the streaks of tracers from my

fighter, flaming comets of warplanes, and bombs falling irretrievably through air.

We still have the possibility, here in America, of building a civilization based on man, where the importance of an enterprise is judged less by its financial profits than by the kind of community it creates; where the measure of a man is his own character, not his power or his wealth. If we have sufficient desire, we can still build a civilization whose leadership rests on the respect and confidence it instills in others, and whose standard of life is the quality of life itself.

But time is short. Looking at the destruction already wrought, at the materialism growing on every side, at the increasing bitterness and unrest throughout the world, at the tremendous power of our latest weapons, a realist might well conclude that many of us now living will see the start of another war, one which will end in more dark ages.

There is no materialistic solution, no political formula, which alone can save us.

Our salvation, and our only salvation, lies in controlling the arm of Western science by the mind of Western philosophy guided by the eternal truths of God. It lies in the balanced quantities of spirit, mind, and body of our people.

TALE OF TWO CITIES

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a letter entitled, "The Tale of Two Cities," which appeared this morning on the editorial page of the Washington Post.

Written by Carl Levin, chairman of the Citizens Committee To Save Lafayette Square, the letter points out the need for adequate facilities in Washington for the presentation of opera and other forms of the performing arts.

I wholeheartedly support Mr. Levin and his committee and hope that the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds will report favorably on this project following hearings scheduled for Monday.

I want to commend Senator RANDOLPH, chairman of the subcommittee, and Senator CHAVEZ, chairman of the Public Works Committee, for their efforts in scheduling hearings on this most worthy project.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Levin's letter be printed in The RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TALE OF TWO CITIES

Your May 11 editorial, "Tale of Two Cities," brought out pointedly the sad incongruity of the relative facilities for the presentation of the arts in New York City and in our Nation's Capital.

The newly formed Citizens Committee to Save Lafayette Square, however, hopes that our effort will be neither "too little" nor "too late."

Though it is true that we undertook our effort late—for the east side of Lafayette Square apparently already is lost—we are convinced that there is still time to save the quiet dignity and utility offered by the old buildings facing on the east side of the White House park.

As you pointed out so well in your editorial, New York City has rallied to save and is saving Carnegie Hall. Simultaneously, it is proceeding to build the Lincoln Center, all of this in addition to numerous other facilities such as the City Center where the New York City Ballet and other such groups

1960

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

9889

latest performance by Eaton is particularly objectionable. His flight, apparently hurriedly, to Paris last night to greet Khrushchev at the airport, after the terrible incident in Paris yesterday, when Khrushchev called the President of the United States a thief and said all these dreadful things about our country and our President, is to me unconscionable. It is unforgivable that an American citizen would fly to Paris and confer with Khrushchev in the most cordial manner, as reported this morning. We do not know what was said. What he did was particularly offensive.

As the Senator has said, I am not at all taking the position that anyone should be denied his right to criticize his Government or any of us. I am simply pointing out to the Attorney General that there is a statute on the law books which forbids private citizens from entering into conversations or correspondence with the heads of other states concerning matters about the U.S. Government and its relations with other governments. That is the law of the land. I believe this man is violating the law. Some others may have been doing so as well. I think the Attorney General ought to prosecute.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I do not, by the slightest suggestion, mean to indicate that I deny the right of an individual to criticize his government or to criticize me or anybody else.

Mr. DODD. Neither do I.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is an American privilege. I only wished to point out a moment ago that when free criticism reaches the point of injury to the general body politic of this country it is time we look into it very carefully.

I suggest also that although I, of course, am not a physician and have no medical competence, I have read about what has taken place, and a question is raised as to a matter of psychological quirk which might be investigated to some profit, so far as this man is concerned. There are evidently certain delusions of grandeur which are not well-founded on the record. It might be well to examine them a little more.

I congratulate the Senator again.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the distinguished Senator from Iowa. I agree with what he says and I emphatically agree with the statement of the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd]. His statement was something which should have been said on the floor of the Senate. What he has said is right and appropriate, and I commend him for it.

Mr. DODD. I thank the Senator from Nebraska.

SPY PLANE INCIDENT

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I discussed with the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore] the fact that I was going to speak on the subject on which I am about to address the Senate, and he very kindly agreed that he would

be present in the Senate today to discuss the matter with me.

Yesterday the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore] in a statement took issue with Vice President Nixon, who disclosed in a speech in Buffalo that at the very time Mr. Khrushchev was making a speech before the United Nations, agents of our country arrested two Russian spies in this country, one of whom at least, I believe, was a member of the Russian mission to this country.

The junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore] took issue with the Vice President on his disclosure of that fact yesterday. In turn, I wish to take issue with the junior Senator from Tennessee.

In most fields of national defense, especially in the field of atomic energy tests and activities of that kind, the junior Senator from Tennessee and I are in very substantial agreement. I admire his zeal and his devotion to the problems involved in international affairs. However, I am sorry that in this instance I must disagree with him very definitely.

Since the U-2 incident was first publicly disclosed I had felt it was high time that we of the United States spread upon the record the days, the dates, and the names of those concerned with Communist espionage in this country over the past years. If we will lay that record before the people, in my judgment, we will find that no country in modern times has engaged in such a vast network of espionage, which has extended on occasions even into the U.S. Government itself. I believe it is high time that those activities should be documented publicly. I was earnestly hopeful that they might have been documented in Paris.

So far as the U-2 incident is concerned, is no question that the Russians knew all along, and for a substantial period of time, that these overflights were occurring. It so happened that this particular incident occurred a short time prior to the conference which was supposed to be held this week in Paris, of which Mr. Khrushchev and the high command took advantage to torpedo the conference. If it had not been for the public knowledge of the U-2 incident, there is no doubt Mr. Khrushchev and his group would have found some other excuse to scuttle the conference.

To return to the criticism of Mr. Nixon by the Senator from Tennessee, I believe it is time that some statements were made, not alone concerning the 2 spies who were captured, but concerning the whole list of those who have spied in this country on behalf of Russia.

We talk much about overflights across Russia. To me there is little difference between a man walking along the ground and gathering information, a man riding in a train and gathering information, a man riding in a commercial airplane and gathering information, and a man flying at 50,000 feet and gathering information. The Russians have been gathering information in this country brazenly. We know that. We have had documentation of their activities.

But what the United States did in the interest of peace was to refrain from bringing these matters before the world, in the hope that a conference in Geneva could be operated on a basis of as much harmony as possible. Therefore I am quite sure that our purpose in refraining from bringing these activities before the Geneva Conference was to avoid contributing additional tensions. However, since the Russians have brought these occurrences before the world, I think we should likewise bring before the world the information which we have. I disagree with the Senator from Tennessee in his criticism. I quote from this morning's issue of the New York Times. The Senator from Tennessee will correct me if this is a misquotation:

Only a few days ago, the Tennessean added, Mr. Nixon was "basking in credit for having arranged the Khrushchev visit to the White House." The Vice President "is an old hand at being hard on Communists and Democrats, as well as with the spy-cop-robbertreason technique." Mr. Gore said.

Mr. President, in all sincerity and in all friendship for the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], and in the light of our long and cordial association, I still say I believe he was unduly brutal and unduly harsh on the Vice President of the United States, who probably did as much as any other man in this country to point up the espionage ring which existed a few years ago in our country. I do not believe he merits criticism for revealing that activity.

The Vice President needs no defense for his own defense of the integrity of the American system. I believe he needs no defense for pointing out after the fact—and he pointed out only two instances of the scores which can be documented—that we refrained as a country from stirring up international tensions by making a big issue out of the spy incident in this country, so that we might have some basis of harmony on which to approach the discussions of peace and the discussions of international tensions.

I feel that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore] is unduly harsh in his criticism, and I feel that he is unjustified in saying that, because the Vice President of the United States in his speech at Buffalo yesterday disclosed only two instances as an illustration, the Vice President should be charged with making cheap politics out of an issue of this kind.

As I said a moment ago, I regret every disagreement which I have with my friend from Tennessee, for in the majority of cases we find ourselves in substantial agreement on questions of international interest. But I do feel that this whole article is unwarranted, and I believe the attack by the Senator from Tennessee was unwarranted and unjustified. I do not believe the American public will accept it as a justifiable attack, under all the circumstances.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point in my remarks the article from this morning's issue of the New York Times, written by Russell Baker, referring to this incident.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GORE CRITICIZES NIXON ON SUMMIT—CALLS TALK ON SOVIET SPIES A CAMPAIGN MOVE—FOUR TOP DEMOCRATS PRESS UNITY
(By Russell Baker)

WASHINGTON, May 18.—Senator ALBERT GORE shattered the domestic political calm over the collapse of the summit meeting with an attack today on Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON's response to the Paris crisis.

It was the first open political clash to come out of the summit breakdown and it came while Democratic leaders for the third consecutive day were making extraordinary efforts to maintain a unified national front behind President Eisenhower.

Senator GORE, a Tennessee Democrat, did not criticize the President, or raise a question on events leading to the summit collapse, but he delivered a cutting denunciation of Mr. NIXON's reaction to the news from Paris.

The Gore attack was provoked by the Vice President's speech in Buffalo today, in which Mr. NIXON gave hitherto secret reports of Soviet spies spotted in Springfield, Mass., during Premier Khrushchev's tour of this country last fall. Mr. NIXON in his speech also challenged the Democrats to investigate the President's refusal to apologize to Mr. Khrushchev in Paris.

While Democrats were "withholding criticism and pleading for unity," Senator GORE said, "Mr. NIXON is talking of how to be hard on communism, and how to deal with Communists, and giving forth about the arrest of Russian spies. Maybe the old NIXON is going to be nominated after all instead of the new."

Why, he asked, was new spy information being made public "in a campaign speech only after the get-along-with-Khrushchev treadmill has come to a crashing halt?"

Only a few days ago, the Tennessean added, Mr. NIXON was "basking in credit for having arranged the Khrushchev visit to the White House." The Vice President "is an old hand at being hard on both Communists and Democrats, as well as with the spy-cop-robber-treason technique," Mr. GORE said.

Other developments here in the wake of the Paris breakdown included these:

Disclosure that four leaders of the Democratic Party had cabled the President yesterday urging him "to convey to Premier Khrushchev the views of the opposition party in your country that he reconsider his suggestion for postponement of the summit conference until after the national elections in this country."

The message was signed by Sam Rayburn of Texas, Speaker of the House; Lyndon B. Johnson of Texas, Democratic Senate leader; Adlai E. Stevenson, Democratic presidential candidate in 1952 and 1956, and J. W. Fulbright of Arkansas, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

A spokesman for the Republican National Committee said that sentiment was building to arrange a big homecoming demonstration in Washington for President Eisenhower when he returns from Europe Friday afternoon.

Congressional leaders quietly dispelled speculation that a special investigation of the administration's presummit maneuvers would be countenanced at the Capitol this year.

PROSPECTS FOR CONGRESS

The prospect was that questions about presummit maneuvers and reassessment of the national position in the wake of a new tough line from Moscow would be dealt with piecemeal in routine committee proceedings.

The renewal of the Democratic leadership's call for unity was based on fears that any

deep division within the United States at this time might weaken its international position while new Soviet intentions were still uncertain.

Another factor was the disgust many Democratic leaders feel for the prospect of making grave international policy a partisan spectacle in this election year. Many of these same Democrats still resent Republican political exploitation of Korean war issues and do not want a Democratic reprisal.

One other factor is the expectation that President Eisenhower will receive a wave of public sympathy in reaction to Mr. Khrushchev's behavior in Paris. At the moment, the Democrats are disposed to wait for the dust to settle before arguing background issues.

The Democratic leadership's message to the President was worked out at the Capitol Monday while Mr. Stevenson was there to testify on the use of television in political campaigns.

"We feel that total failure of the [summit] conference and increasing mistrust on both sides will be serious and deeply disturbing to the world," it said.

"All of the American people earnestly desire peace, an end to the arms race and ever better relations between our countries. We ask you as the leader of this nation to see that these views are conveyed to Mr. Khrushchev."

Aside from its value as a demonstration to the Russians of the U.S. internal unity, the message was designed to destroy the idea that Mr. Khrushchev might get a better bargain by waiting for a new President to be elected. The Soviet Premier proposed postponing summit conferences until after the national election in the United States. Both parties are sensitive and angry about this Soviet interference in domestic politics.

Mr. GORE, Mr. President, I am grateful for the generous references of my friend and distinguished colleague, the able senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]. As he has done, I, too, wish to pay tribute to the warm friendship which he and I enjoy serving together, as we do, on two committees and having found ourselves upon many occasions not only personally agreeable to each other, which relation, I say to my friend, I have enjoyed thoroughly, but also many times we have had an affinity of views upon questions affecting our national security.

The Senator has just said there are many more cases which are being suppressed. Are they, too, to be fed out piecemeal for campaign oratory?

The essential question I raised yesterday was that of secrecy. Why has this information so long been withheld from the American people? If there are scores more, I call upon the Government of the United States to give this information to the American people. Secrecy in Government has gone entirely too far. I do not wish to refer to incidents prior to or involved in the regrettable tragedy of the Paris Conference. As other Members of the Senate have said, there will be a proper time to discuss our individual feelings of humiliation and that of our country. The proper time has already occurred to express resentment, which every American must have felt, at the insults heaped upon the President of the United States. I expressed my resentment on the floor of the Senate.

I do not wish now to make reference to other sentiments and views which I have withheld and will withhold until the proper time.

However, I am not sure that a suppression of the news involving Russian espionage in our country has contributed to peace. If there are scores of additional incidents, I call upon the Government to release the information to the American people.

I read from a dispatch from United Press International, of today:

The Vice President, who made the disclosure during a political swing through upstate New York—

I asked two questions yesterday. Why had this information been kept secret from the American people since last September? When did these other score or more occur? Has that information been suppressed, too, for 6 or 8 or 10 months, or longer?

The second question I asked was, Why is it now made public in a political speech after the debacle in Paris? I interpret this as an effort to convert the tragedy in Paris to political advantage.

My friend the distinguished Senator from Iowa says that in that judgment I am harsh. I do not wish to reach harsh judgments, or to render brutal verdicts. I submit to the Senate the record and ask each Senator to determine for himself whether the cause of peace has been served by the suppression from the people of the United States, by secrecy, of information involving espionage attempts reaching into scores of incidents, as we are told; whether such secrecy is proper and in the public interest.

Each Senator may determine for himself whether this was a political use of information which heretofore had been denied the American people, but which on yesterday was used, according to the news dispatch, on a political swing through upstate New York.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, or would he prefer to continue?

Mr. GORE. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. With regard to the Senator's contention that this is information which has been kept secret, I certainly join him in saying that we should now make these cases public, that they should be documented and should be told to the world.

Mr. GORE. Before the Senator goes further, I am glad that he joins me in that expression. Will he also join me in the suggestion or request that the Government of the United States, through its established agencies having jurisdiction, make this information public rather than making it public piecemeal through political speeches?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is the point I was just approaching. It has been made public. It has been made public repeatedly over the years. I call the Senator's attention to the insertion in the RECORD of yesterday made by the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], at page 9793 of the RECORD, where there appears a list of 65 Russian spy cases, naming names, naming incidents which have occurred in the

1960

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

9891

United States since 1946, which have had full publicity and which are known. I shall not repeat the names now; they are all printed in the Record beginning at page 9793. ~~To supplement that information, there is listed a very substantial number of foreign cases in which Russian spies have been convicted, and sentenced in most cases—activities in Switzerland, West Germany, Greece, Japan.~~ I shall not take the time to delineate all of them, but they are in the Record. These are all cases that have been made public, but the last two the Senator refers to were apparently the most recent ones that had occurred.

The American public and the world should know these things. They should know that the Russians have been the masters of espionage in the world, and have probably exceeded all other countries in the world in espionage. I think it is high time we let that fact be known. I did not think we should stir up this situation prior to the great attempt at the summit to achieve a peaceful solution of the tensions of the world. I thought it wise not to bring up these irritants beforehand.

However, now that Mr. Khrushchev has found this "fish out of water"; now that he has disclosed what the intentions of the Russians are, and that he has no intention of seeking a solution of world tensions on any realistic basis, I think the time has come for us to tell the world exactly and to emphasize exactly what the Russians have been doing in the field of espionage, and thus lay the activities of most of the other countries in the shade.

However, that list was placed in the Record yesterday by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt] and is now available for all to see.

Mr. GORE. I again shall decline to refer to the assumptions upon which the U.S. approach to the summit conference was rationalized. At the proper time, I shall address the Senate upon that and related subjects. I do not regard today as the proper time to do that.

I should like to inquire of the distinguished Senator from Iowa if the list to which he refers, which appears in the Record, as I understand, and is available only this morning, and therefore was not printed before the disclosures in the upstate New York political swing yesterday, includes the two instances in September, to which the Vice President referred.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. A cursory reading of the list indicates that they do not appear. I cannot find them in the list at the moment. The list comprises one column on page 9793, three columns on page 9794, and one and three-quarters columns on page 9795. So upon a quick examination, I cannot say whether the two cases are included. However, it is my impression that the list does not include those two cases.

Mr. GORE. One question seems to remain between us. The Senator from Iowa has joined with me in a request and a suggestion that a full disclosure of Soviet espionage efforts be made public. Would the Senator also join with

me in asking that such information be released by the ~~Government and agencies of the Government having jurisdiction over such matters~~, and of whom, I feel certain, the representatives of the free press will soon make inquiry, rather than to have it fed to the public piecemeal in a political campaign for political advantage and use?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I must say to the Senator from Tennessee that I would not necessarily support a full disclosure of all espionage cases in this country, for the very reason that the American self-interest and security might not warrant such a disclosure. In certain cases, if knowledge of espionage activities were disclosed at the present time, it might give information to the enemy, to the detriment of the United States. There are some cases which cannot be disclosed at the time they are discovered, and should not be disclosed. They should be kept very secret, simply because of the techniques which are used. The espionage effort in which the Russians are engaged is a very clever game.

Generally speaking, I believe the number of cases which can be disclosed without harm to the national security and without harm to our friends should be documented, so as to counter the Soviet espionage activities. I think such cases should be disclosed. It does not make any difference to me how they are disclosed, but I think the circumstances of them should be available to the public.

I had hoped, for instance, that if the conference took place, and Mr. Khrushchev began to make much of the so-called U-2 incident, the President would have with him a list of Soviet espionage cases to throw right back in Khrushchev's face. But the conference did not take place. I do not know whether what I have suggested would have been done. However, I had hoped we would be prepared to do that.

Mr. GORE. The able Senator, in replying to my question, instead of answering it, has raised two more questions.

Shall the Vice President, in a political campaign, determine what shall be secret and what shall not be secret? The Senator from Iowa says it does not make much difference to him as to how such information is released. I say that is a matter of propriety and importance. It is one of the two principal issues I raised. The other was secrecy. The Senator from Iowa has said that in some cases the interests of this country might well be served by disclosure. If so, I am willing to have the proper authorities make that determination.

However, I wonder if the Senator would agree that any information which can be disclosed in a political speech, to be specific, should, in an orderly way, be made available to the American people and the free press by the agencies of Government having proper jurisdiction?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I see no reason why any information along that line, the release of which would not be detrimental to the activities of the United States, should not be disclosed to everybody or should not be made available to everybody.

Mr. GORE. Shall it remain classified until a candidate for political office decides that it may be fortuitous to release such information?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. No; I do not believe in the system of classification by convenience, and I never have. I do not think what the Senator says is necessarily so. Nevertheless, I think it is high time that the Government disclose to the American people what is taking place. So far as I know, the only persons who can disclose it are the officials who know about it.

Mr. GORE. The Senator from Iowa has used some rather strong language. It is not the most pleasant experience that one can have in this body to have one of his esteemed colleagues and friends say that he has reached a brutal judgment. I thought I reached an entirely justified judgment. I thought I raised proper questions. I think the record bears me out.

I ask the Senator again, specifically and pointedly, since he has joined with me in a request that such information as will not be injurious to the national interest be disclosed to the public, will he also join with me in the request that the agencies concerned reach such a determination and disclose the information to the public, rather than reserve it until a candidate for political office, in an upstate swing in New York, or in a political swing in some other State, decides it is fortuitous to release it?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have not joined with the Senator from Tennessee in any particular request. I have merely stated that I think the spying activities of the Kremlin which are taking place in this country and elsewhere should be documented and disclosed to this country and to the rest of the world, except in those cases where it would be a disservice to our own national security or the national security of our allies to disclose individual incidents.

Mr. GORE. If the Senator from Iowa does not wish to join with me in that request, I join with him in what he has said.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I welcome the Senator's statement. So far as my accusing the Senator from Tennessee of being brutal is concerned, I did not intend to accuse the Senator of being brutal. I think the phrase I used was that I thought he was unduly harsh in his criticism. I take it there is a little difference in the connotations of "brutality" and "harshness."

Mr. GORE. I accept the modification. Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I think "harsh" is a little less brutal than "brutal."

Mr. GORE. I accept the modification with appreciation.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I would never accuse the Senator from Tennessee of being brutal, because he is not a brutal man. It is not his instinct to be brutal.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. However, I think the Senator from Tennessee on occasion, perhaps, can put himself in a position where I think he is undoubtedly harsh, and without doubt I can put myself in a position where the Senator from

9892

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 19

Tennessee may think I am unduly harsh. I think there is a difference; and I do not wish to have the RECORD indicate that I am accusing the Senator from Tennessee of brutality, because that is farthest from my thought.

Mr. GORE. I may have been accused of worse, I may say.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Of course, those of us who have been in politics for some years have been accused of a great many things, and we get used to that.

But so far as concerns disclosing something in a political campaign, let me say that political campaigns are for the purpose of discussing the issues. I take it the Senator from Tennessee is raising the objection because of the fact the Vice President disclosed the incident referred to in connection with a speech on what might be considered to have been a political occasion. I see no reason why he should not have disclosed it. I do not know that it was classified information beforehand. It may have been; I have no knowledge about that.

But I repeat that I think the world should know with some detail of the activities of the Kremlin. And regardless of what may be considered the wise way to issue such information, I think it should be put out. I think it should be laid down for all to see; and then I think it would answer, or should answer, the questions asked by a number of well-meaning people in this country.

I have received letters from several persons who have had the opportunity to say that we should apologize to the Russians—although most of the letters I have received have expressed just the opposite view. But when the few who favor the making of an apology realize what we have done by way of gathering necessary information to protect the security of this country, as against what the Russians are planning to do over there, from a military standpoint, and when they consider what our country has done by way of gathering such information and what the Russians have done in this country for years and years and years, I think such persons will change their opinion as to the desirability and the necessity of our securing information as to what the enemy is plotting against us.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I shall not press my friend further.

I shall close by recalling that as soon as I heard the report that the Russian dictator had demanded an ignoble apology by the President of the United States, I rose on the floor of the Senate and expressed resentment, and said the American people could be confident that the President of the United States, the embodiment of America's pride and hopes for peace, would respond as a gentleman of honor.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR ROBERTSON AT JAMESTOWN, VA.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, on Sunday, May 15, Mrs. Talmadge and I had the privilege of joining the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr.

STENNIS], and the distinguished junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] in attending the impressive ceremonies held at Jamestown Island, Va., commemorating the landing of the first permanent English settlers in America and the rededication of the Robert Hunt Memorial Shrine, which honors the founder of the first Protestant church in America. The combined services were sponsored by the Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities, with the cooperation of the Bruton Parish Church, the College of William and Mary, the Colonial National Historical Park, Colonial Williamsburg, and the Jamestown Foundation.

The principal address of the occasion was delivered by the respected junior Senator from Virginia, and was an eloquent and stirring tribute to the unwavering faith in God and staunch adherence to the tenets of freedom of our Founding Fathers. It was an inspiring experience; and I came away with the firm conviction that it would be beneficial, indeed, if every man and woman in public life in America could visit and see for themselves this historic site from which have sprung the institutions of liberty which have given us on this continent the greatest and freest Nation in the history of mankind.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the full text of the remarks of the junior Senator from Virginia on that occasion be printed herewith in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAITH OF OUR FATHERS

(Remarks of Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON at the 353d anniversary of the first permanent English settlement in America at Jamestown, Va., May 15, 1960)

On this 353d anniversary of the landing of English settlers at Jamestown, I welcome the privilege of joining with distinguished church leaders in paying tribute to the memory of Robert Hunt, the first chaplain of the Jamestown settlement who served in that capacity until his death in July of 1608. The fact that those first settlers had a deep and abiding faith in the teachings of the Bible is not as well known as the faith of those who settled at Plymouth 13 years later. The latter had come to a new land in search of religious freedom, whereas the Virginia settlers had come in search of gold. But members of the church of England had made a substantial contribution to the London Co. which financed the Jamestown settlement on the condition that it could send with the first settlers a chaplain and the further condition that the Christian religion would be brought to the savages of the North American Continent. Evidently, therefore, the first chaplain, Robert Hunt, was chosen by the Archbishop of Canterbury and his work was highly praised by Capt. John Smith who said that he was "an honest, religious and courageous divine." Smith also said of the first religious services at Jamestown: "We had daily common prayer morning and evening, every Sunday two sermons, and every 3 months the holy communion, till our minister died; but our prayers daily, with an homily on Sundays, we continued 2 or 3 years after, till more preachers came; and surely God did most mercifully hear us."

At the untimely death of their rector, at about 40 years of age, the colonists not only

paid tribute to the religious and social work that he had done among them but to his readiness to defend the settlement, upon any alarm as quickly as any man and of his constant encouragement to the men at Jamestown to persist in their attempt to plant a successful colony. Again, when the first session of the assembly met in 1619 (Incidentally, the first elected governing body ever to serve in this country) the first order of business was a prayer by Reverend Buck, then the minister at Jamestown. That action was noted in the records of the assembly in the following terms: "But for as much as men's affairs do little prosper where God's service is neglected; all the Burgesses took their places in the choir, till a prayer was said by Mr. Buck, the minister, that it would please God to guide us and sanctify all our proceedings to his own glory, and the good of this plantation."

In the Senate of the United States we have an organization known as the Breakfast Group, which meets each Wednesday morning at 8:30 for breakfast and then for a 30-minute discussion of some religious topic for which some member is designated each week as the leader. I am proud of the fact that four members of that Breakfast Group have accompanied me to Williamsburg and Jamestown not only to join in our tribute to the memory of the first chaplain of the Jamestown settlement but also to indicate their appreciation of the significance in the subsequent development of the most powerful nation in the world, of the religious faith that was translated into George Mason's Bill of Rights, into Thomas Jefferson's Declaration of Independence, and into the Philadelphia Constitution of 1787, all of which are based upon the teachings of the Bible.

Needless to say, all members of our Senate group share the sentiments concerning this historic area of the Old Dominion expressed by Daniel Webster at the laying of the cornerstone of the Bunker Hill Monument when he said: "We are justly proud of being descended from men who have set the world an example of founding civil institutions on the great and united principles of human freedom and human knowledge. To us, their children, the story of their labors and sufferings can never be without interest. We shall not stand unmoved on the shore of Plymouth, while the sea continues to wash it, nor will our brethren in another early and ancient colony forget the place of its first establishment till their river shall cease to flow by it. No vigor of youth, no maturity of manhood, will lead the Nation to forget the spots where its infancy was cradled and defended."

Last night we were privileged to see a moving picture made for use during the Jamestown celebration of 1957 which, among other things, depicted the debate in the house of burgesses concerning the oppression of the sister colony of Massachusetts by the British Crown and the adoption on May 24, 1774, of the following resolution:

"This house, being deeply impressed with apprehension of the great dangers, to be derived to British America, from the hostile invasion of the city of Boston, in our sister colony of Massachusetts Bay, whose commerce and harbor are, on the first day of June next, to be stopped by an armed force, deem it highly necessary that the said first day of June be set apart, by the members of this house, as a day of fasting, humiliation, and prayer, devoutly to implore the divine interposition, for averting the heavy calamity which threatens destruction to our civil rights, and the evils of civil war; to give us one heart and one mind firmly to oppose, by all just and proper means, every injury to American rights; and that the minds of His Majesty and his Parliament may be inspired from above with wisdom, moderation,

1960

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

9893

and justice, to remove from the loyal people of America all cause of danger, from a continued pursuit of measures, pregnant with their ruin.

"Ordered, therefore, that the Members of this House do attend in their places, at the hour of 10 in the forenoon, on the said 1st day of June next, in order to proceed with the Speaker, and the mace, to the church in this city, for the purposes aforesaid; and that the Reverend Mr. Price be appointed to read prayers, and the Reverend Mr. Gwatkin to preach a sermon, suitable to the occasion."

George Washington, who helped to frame that resolution of 1774 knelt in the snows of Valley Forge to ask the help of God to carry on an unequal military struggle for independence and it was Washington who was presiding over the Philadelphia Constitutional Convention in the summer of 1787 when his friend, Benjamin Franklin said: "In this situation of this assembly groping as it were in the dark to find political truth, and scarce able to distinguish it when presented to us, how has it happened, Sir, that we have not hitherto once thought of humbly applying to the Father of Light to illuminate our understanding? In the beginning of the contest with Great Britain, when we were sensible of danger we had daily prayer in this room for the divine protection. Our prayers, Sir, were heard, and they were graciously answered. All of us who were engaged in the struggle must have observed frequent instances of a superintending providence in our favor. To that kind providence we owe this happy opportunity of consulting in peace on the means of establishing our future national felicity. And have we now forgotten that powerful friend? Or do we imagine that we no longer need His assistance? I have lived, Sir, a long time, and the longer I live, the more convincing proofs I see of this truth—that God governs in the affairs of men. And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without His aid?"

Again, in 1789, Washington said in his inaugural address: "It would be peculiarly improper to omit in this first official act my fervent supplications to that Almighty Being who rules over the universe, who presides in the councils of nations, and whose providential aids can supply every human defect, that His benediction may consecrate to the liberties and happiness of the people of the United States a government instituted by themselves for these essential purposes, and may enable every instrument employed in its administration to execute with success the functions allotted to his charge."

All Members of the Congress, and I assume that laymen generally, are aware of the fact that the Soviet Union possesses intercontinental missiles capable of reaching any part of our Nation in the course of some 25 or 30 minutes after being fired, that the hydrogen warhead of those missiles has a destructive force for a radius of 10 miles or more, that the fallout from such a missile will poison the exposed food and water supplies for a radius of several hundred miles and that we have no adequate nor satisfactory defense against a missile attack of that character. And since we can fire a nuclear weapon from a submerged submarine, it is only reasonable to assume that the Soviet Union has the same capability. It is also a matter of common knowledge that in the event of an all-out nuclear war, our casualties in the first few days of such a conflict would be tabulated in terms of millions.

It is, therefore, with the hope of staying the hand of a possible aggressor that in recent years we have been devoting more than one-half of the total tax revenue of our Government for the operation and development of our Defense Establishment.

In our visit today to this historic area whose contribution to the birth of our Nation should never be forgotten, we should be acutely conscious of the fact that we are as much in need for God's help as were the 3 million relatively poor and untrained colonists in their struggle for freedom against the then strongest military power in the world. The recent destruction in Russia of a CIA observation plane indicates how easily a cold war could suddenly turn into a shooting war. It illustrates the urgent need for a program of international disarmament, while at the same time casting a grade shadow over prospects for a successful summit conference in Paris.

By our presence here where our experiment in representative democracy started, where our concept of personal liberty under God was proclaimed to the world, the Members of our Senate Breakfast Group desire to indicate our deep concern over the fact that at a time when our beloved Nation is threatened from without by a deadly foe she also is threatened by destruction from within by spiritual indifference and moral deterioration.

The conflict of deepest concern is not might against superior might. The major issue which faces us today is this: Will America accept the moral challenge of this hour, as she has accepted the military challenge of past years, or will she allow this glorious opportunity to slip from her grasp forever?

This, my friends, is the world leadership to which we are called: to stand before the nations of the entire world and say with young David: "Thou comest to me with a sword, and with a spear, and with a shield: but I came to thee in the name of the Lord of hosts."

In stemming the tide of the anti-God ideology of communism—the unseen forces of a mighty God are on our side, and we can go confidently forward in the power of His might when we take Him at His word as He says: "If my people, which are called by my name, shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways; then will I hear from Heaven, and will forgive their sin, and will heal their land."

MR. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield, so that I may comment on the same matter?

MR. TALMADGE. I am delighted to yield.

MR. CARLSON. Mr. President, I had the honor and the privilege of attending the ceremonies commemorating the landing of the first permanent English settlers in America, and the rededication of the Robert Hunt Memorial Shrine on Sunday, May 15, at Jamestown Island.

As has already been mentioned, our distinguished colleague the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] delivered an outstanding address on our heritage as a nation and our obligation to preserve it.

It was 353 years ago on May 13 that three small ships, the *Discovery*, the *Godspeed*, and the *Susan Constant* dropped anchor at an island in Virginia, which the settlers immediately named Jamestown.

The little settlement at Jamestown passed through many crises; and I am confident that the story is familiar to everyone who has read our early history.

Dr. Louis B. Wright, director of the Folger Library, has said:

No other spot in either hemisphere carries so much significance as Jamestown.

On this occasion we were again commemorating the fact that the landing was not only the beginning of a new nation, but it was also the beginning of religious worship in our Nation.

It should be remembered that the settlers who landed at Jamestown were in many instances very religious people. The first thing they did when they landed on the sandy soil of Point Comfort was to erect a cross. And when they reached Jamestown Island, they took some of the sails from the ship and made a tent-chapel in which they thanked God for a safe voyage. The pastor of the colony was a remarkable man by the name of Robert Hunt.

In 1907, the dioceses of Virginia, southern Virginia, and West Virginia dedicated a memorial to the Reverend Robert Hunt, in the form of a handsome bronze relief tablet. It was at that spot that our colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia, delivered his stirring address.

This monument and the restoration of Williamsburg are not only memorials; they are also reminders to every American citizen of the sacrifices our forefathers endured in order to establish a true Republic based on the rights of the individual.

The Nation is indebted to the late John D. Rockefeller, Jr., for his foresight and his dedication in preserving these historical landmarks for all generations. It was his aim to recreate a shrine where great events of colonial history might be visualized in their proper setting, and where a revival of crafts, music, and literature would not only comprise major activities of the city of Williamsburg, but also would bring to the 20th century an appreciation of the important cultural gifts it has received from colonial times.

In this age, we of this generation must again rededicate ourselves to the principles of those who have gone before. We must, as the settlers of old, again give thanks to divine providence for the many blessings that have befallen this Nation, and at the same time pray for divine guidance in order that this heritage may be preserved for future generations.

I thank the Senator from Georgia for yielding to me.

MR. STENNIS. Mr. President, on last Sunday, May 15, it was my privilege to attend the ceremonies at Jamestown Island, commemorating the landing of the first permanent English settlers in America and the rededication of the Robert Hunt Memorial Shrine. We met there to pay honor to these and other early settlers who founded our great Nation, and to rededicate ourselves to their basic principles in meeting the problems of today.

The speaker for this occasion was well chosen indeed, our colleague, the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. He did a masterful job, just as always, in paying tribute to those patriotic and spiritual leaders who settled and founded this Nation. His interesting and inspiring message held the audience of more than 1,000 people in rapt attention.

Mr. President, I also wish to mention briefly the fine contribution colonial

Williamsburg is making in enlightening our people of our early history, and in inspiring the members of this generation to adhere more closely to those principles on which our Nation was founded. While we were at Williamsburg, the flags were at half-mast, in memory of that great benefactor who made colonial Williamsburg possible, the late John D. Rockefeller, Jr., to whom this and all future generations owe a great debt. The administration of colonial Williamsburg is most ably directed by its president, Mr. Carlisle H. Humelsine.

Again, I congratulate the junior Senator from Virginia on his masterful address, which is worthy of the careful reading and study of each Member of the Congress. I am happy it is being placed in the Record, thereby being made available to all citizens of our Nation.

THE NEUTRON BOMB

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, last week I made a lengthy statement to the Senate on the fallacy of the test ban. Among other things, I warned that if the Kremlin were to beat us to a major technological breakthrough, we might shortly find ourselves confronted with a choice between surrender and annihilation. One of the possible breakthroughs which I mentioned was the development of a neutron bomb.

Commenting on my statement, Newsweek Periscope for this week said:

THE DODD BOMB A DUD

Senator THOMAS J. DODD's demands for information on the neutron bomb—a weapon that supposedly kills by radiation alone without blast or heat—will be ignored. Reason: There is no such device. Scientists explained that they know no way to produce a radiation weapon without heat and blast. (A reactor would do it, but bombers don't drop reactors on the enemy.)

I have the greatest respect for Newsweek. In general, I think its reporting reflects a careful regard for the truth. In this case, however, I feel that Newsweek could not have read my statement too carefully and that they were, in addition, the victims of calculated misinformation from pro-test-ban sources.

I ask unanimous consent that my statement in respect to the neutron bomb be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Then there is the matter of the neutron bomb, to which there has already been some reference in the press. Such a bomb can theoretically be produced by tailoring the energy of a fusion explosion so that, instead of heat and blast, its primary product is a burst of neutrons. Such a burst would do negligible physical damage, but it would immediately destroy all life in the target area. It would, in short, operate as a kind of death ray.

I have heard that, in the light of present theoretical knowledge, the neutron bomb is no more questionable than the hydrogen bomb was 6 months before it was demonstrated that one could be built. Although there have been a few fragmentary references to the neutron bomb in the press, I was told, when I tried to obtain more information, that the matter was classified.

When I pressed my physicist friend further, he threw up his hands in despair and said: "You must forgive me, I have never heard of a neutron."

I consider all the hush-hush that surrounds the neutron bomb to be a glaring instance of the official abuse of secrecy. To keep the facts of life on the nuclear age from the American people is foolish, and potentially disastrous. If there is a possibility that a neutron bomb can be built, if there appears to be any chance that the Soviets may succeed in building one before we do, then the American people have a right to the facts.

The current issue of Foreign Affairs contains a remarkable article on the question of the test ban by Dr. Freeman J. Dyson. Dr. Dyson quotes a paragraph from a report by the prominent Soviet physicist, L. L. Artsmovitch entitled "Research on Controlled Thermonuclear Reactions in the U.S.S.R.," printed in December 1958. Let me read this paragraph very slowly:

"It may also be possible to realize a pulsed thermonuclear reaction under conditions in which the high temperature is produced by a charge of conventional explosive (such as TNT or something more powerful) which surrounds a capsule containing heavy hydrogen. Without dwelling on the experimental details, we may note that conditions have been found under which the generation of neutrons in hydrogen reactions has been established reliably and reproducibly. In experiments carried out in 1952, there is no doubt that we have observed neutrons which are formed as a result of the heating of matter to extremely high temperatures."

From this, it is apparent that the Russians were experimenting with fission-free hydrogen devices as far back as 1952 and that, as a corollary of this, they have for years had some understanding of the possibilities of the neutron bomb.

Once upon a time there was no hydrogen bomb. But there were a few scientists, a tiny but brave minority, who said it could be made and who urged that we embark on a crash program of development, lest the Kremlin beat us to it. At that time we had a President, Harry Truman, who have the facts to the people. Had he not done so, had he not enjoyed the public support that only comes from understanding, the production of the H bomb might have been deferred beyond that fateful day in 1953 when the Soviets exploded their own first H bomb.

I believe President Eisenhower owes a similar duty to the American people in the case of the neutron bomb. The President should tell the people what the scientists told him. Not to do so would be a dereliction that can only lead to the most dangerous kind of speculation.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the Newsweek article said there is no such device as a neutron bomb. I never said that there was. I simply said that there were many scientists who were convinced it could be made. The Newsweek article implies I said that scientists know of a way to produce a radiation weapon without heat and blast. I said no such thing. I said that there was no theoretical reason why a neutron bomb could not be produced, and I implied that there were quite a few scientists who considered the project practicable. I said that if such a bomb were produced, a burst of neutrons would be the primary, but not the exclusive manner in which it released its energy.

For the record at this point, I want to say that I checked all of the facts in my statement carefully, not with one expert or even two experts, but in most cases

with either three or four experts in the field. I am convinced that my facts were accurate.

For the record, too, I would like to point out that there have been references to the possibility of producing a neutron bomb in a number of scholarly publications. For example, the eminent nuclear physicist, Dr. F. J. Dyson, in the article in Foreign Affairs which I have quoted said:

There seems to be no law of nature forbidding the construction of fission-free bombs. The question remains whether this theoretical possibility is likely soon to be realized.

There are some very able physicists who believe that the neutron bomb—which would be a fission-free bomb—is in the cards for the next few years. There are other physicists who believe that it may be a very long time away.

There were many scientists who said the A-bomb could not be built. There were many more, including Dr. Hans Bethe, the President's chief adviser on the test ban, who said the H-bomb could not be built. I have seen it stated that our test program was delayed for 2 years because Dr. Vannevar Bush held the project was impractical. In general, it would be fair to say that the pessimists have been proved wrong and the optimists have been proved right.

Personally, I see the greatest resemblance between the situation that obtains today on the question of the neutron bomb and the situation that obtained in the immediate postwar period, on the question of developing the hydrogen bomb. At that time, there were many scientists who were so horrified by Hiroshima that they were emotionally opposed to the development of even more terrible weapons of destruction. Sometimes they would say the H-bomb could not be made. At other times they would say that, even if it could be made, it should not be made.

There was no willful sabotage. On the other hand, the human mind being what it is, I am convinced that those scientists who were emotionally opposed to the creation of an H-bomb, were disposed, by virtue of this opposition, to be pessimistic and defeatist. Since they felt it should not be done, they argued that it could not be done. In fact, they actually believed it could not be done because, as I see it, their terror and their sense of guilt robbed them of their capacity for scientific as well as political judgment.

Where would we be today if it had not been for the handful of brave and persistent scientists who took the stand that, precisely because the H-bomb was so horrible, the free world could not permit the Kremlin to beat it to it?

Once again we are confronted with a situation in which a minority of scientists take the stand that radically new types of nuclear weapons probably will be built, and if they are built, we must build them first. On the other hand, there are those who have grave misgivings about any qualitative or quantitative expansion in the field of nuclear weaponry, and who, not very surprisingly, question the feasibility of any ma-

1960

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

9895

for breakthrough. In the present critical situation, whose words shall we take? The word of those scientists who say "we should not" and "we cannot," or the word of those who say "we must" and "we can"? I think this question is most effectively answered by recent history.

ARMED FORCES DAY: DEDICATION OF U.S. POWER FOR PEACE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Saturday, May 21, the Nation—as proclaimed by President Eisenhower—will observe Armed Forces Day. In 1960 the overall theme for the observances is "Power for Peace."

Across the Nation, special activities will be undertaken to promote greater public understanding of the need of power for peace. The programs will include:

Paying tribute to men and women of our armed services for their contribution to our security;

Stressing the civilian-military teamwork that, historically, has preserved our freedom;

Displaying the land, sea, air and space weapons and equipment to illustrate the scope of our power for peace;

Creating greater understanding of the need for such defenses as a deterrent to aggression; and

Rededicating ourselves to the traditional U.S. policy of utilizing such Armed Forces—mighty and powerful—only for defense, halting aggression, or for promoting stability in areas threatened by outside forces.

Mr. President, last night for 2½ hours Mr. Khrushchev had the television stations of this country opened for his abuse, for his tirade. I could not help thinking, Will there be reciprocity in that respect for the President of the United States and the people who want to speak on the subject, to tell the people of the Kremlin the true story.

Khrushchev, we know, sort of "let the cat out of the bag." He said that when he was at Camp David he was going to ask the President about the trips such as the flight of the U-2, but he did not, for the President was so kindly then. Khrushchev has known for years that in order to protect our own country and to protect the West we have been seeking to get the facts of life in relation to the Kremlin and what it is doing. We have seen the threats. We have seen countries taken over; for instance, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Rumania, the Baltic States, and part of Finland. The world knows that, but it has a tendency to fall asleep.

In a crisis-weary world, all of us yearn for the time—yet somewhere in the unforeseeable future—when we can beat our swords into plowshares and turn a vast volume of resources, manpower and brainpower to programs that will benefit—not threaten to destroy—mankind.

The turn of world events at the Paris meeting, however, provides us more evidence of the need for maintaining a strong defense, coordinated with our allies, as a matter of self-interest and security.

The tantrums of Premier Khrushchev—pounding the table, spewing insults, shouting threats and "flexing his missiles"—regrettably recalls images of tyrades and tyrants of the past. The world, I believe, would rather forget such bad memories.

In the face of such emotional outbursts—created by "cooked up" rather than real factors—the thermometer readings of the global temperature—or perhaps, more accurately, "temper"—regrettably are "shooting up." As a world leader, however, we need—as President Eisenhower so nobly demonstrated in Paris—to be calm and cool, making reasoned evaluations (a) of the impact of Mr. Khrushchev's antics and (b) insofar as possible, an assessment of what it really means as a greater threat to world peace.

The Armed Forces Day observances, I believe, offer a real opportunity not to illustrate counter "rocket-rattling" but rather a rededication to peace; at the same time, the defense displays themselves, I believe, will be ample worry to any enemy that—if attacked—we are ready, willing and able to defend ourselves, and world peace.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, following my remarks, several Armed Forces Day statements on its purposes and objectives.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARMED FORCES DAY STATEMENTS

Robert B. Anderson, Secretary of Treasury: "On this Armed Forces Day, all Americans join in paying tribute to the men and women of our armed services who are making such a vital contribution to the strength and security of our country. The preservation of our free way of life depends in large measure upon their faithful and efficient performance of duty. However, the responsibility for keeping America strong rests not only upon our Military Establishment, but also upon the dedicated efforts of all our citizens to maintain a vigorous and progressive economy. Let us all go forward, therefore, in the common effort to build an America capable of playing its full part in the maintenance of world peace."

Wilber M. Brucker, Secretary of the Army: "The U.S. Army proudly joins in the observance of Armed Forces Day. Designated for public celebration throughout the Nation, it is a fitting reminder of the civilian-military teamwork that has played—and will continue to play—such an essential part in the preservation of our way of life."

W. B. Franke, Secretary of the Navy: "The Armed Forces Day slogan, 'Power for Peace,' means not only the military might of the United States but the power of 178 million Americans—aware of their responsibilities—working daily within the framework of our Constitution to maintain freedom and bring about a lasting world peace. We of the Navy—which steadfastly upholds the cause of freedom and peace—invite our fellow Americans to visit with us on Armed Forces Day 1960."

Dudley C. Sharp, Secretary of the Air Force: "Armed Forces Day gives all Americans an opportunity to join in grateful tribute to the men and women of our military services. We acknowledge that their strength is our best hope of peace and our assurance of survival. On this day the Air Force salutes its sister services, the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps. Also, the Air Force opens

its bases to the public and is glad to welcome its many friends so that they may become better acquainted with the Air Force and the part it plays in the defense of our country and our allies."

Gen. N. F. Twining, Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff: "To an important extent the effectiveness of the Armed Forces is dependent upon the intelligent support of the American people. The observance of Armed Forces Day is one of the traditional opportunities for the men and women in uniform to explain and demonstrate to our fellow Americans the adequacy of our equipment, training, and combat strength. An honest appraisal of our defenses should convince the public that we are using, and will continue to use, our available resources to the best advantage in our national interest."

Gen. L. L. Lemnitzer, Chief of Staff, U.S. Army: "Each year, Armed Forces Day offers the American people an opportunity to see at firsthand how their Military Establishment is accomplishing its missions in the defense of our Nation. The United States Army extends a cordial invitation to all Americans to visit its posts and activities on Armed Forces Day—1960."

Adm. Arleigh Burke, Chief of Naval Operations: "The Navy has made great strides forward in technology, but the ultimate weapon of defense is still the alert, dedicated individual, both in and out of the Armed Forces. On this Armed Forces Day we invite our fellow countrymen to visit our bases, inspect our facilities, and meet our Navy men and women in order that they may become better informed of the status of their Navy."

Gen. Thomas D. White, Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force: "On this 11th Armed Forces Day, we in the U.S. Air Force rededicate ourselves to the preservation of freedom and continued peace."

"Our Air Force is a powerful deterrent to aggression. While our Nation will never commit aggression, we must stand ever ready to defend our freedom."

"We salute our sister services, proud of our position on the integrated defense team which serves to protect our cherished heritage."

Gen. David M. Shoup, Commandant of the Marine Corps: "Armed Forces Day, 1960, is an excellent opportunity for Americans to become better acquainted with their Armed Forces and with the vital role played by each of the services in maintaining our national security. The U.S. Marine Corps, our Nation's amphibious force in readiness, extends a hearty 'welcome aboard' to one and all."

Vice Adm. A. C. Richmond, Commandant, U.S. Coast Guard: "In these difficult times, it is imperative that our Nation maintain a strong and efficient Military Establishment. I urge, therefore, that all Americans take advantage of this Armed Forces Day to find out what is being done to protect our hard-won heritage of freedom."

SENATOR WILEY SAYS WASHINGTON WORKLOAD PREVENTS HIS ADDRESSING REPUBLICAN CONVENTION, BUT RESTATES OFFER TO CAMPAIGN AFTER PRIMARY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the following is the text of a message I sent to Mr. Claude Jasper, chairman of the Republican Party of Wisconsin:

I find that it will be impossible for me to address Republican convention this year. Critical world situation, legislation of vital interest to Wisconsin, and important week-end conference demand my presence in Nation's Capital. I stand ready, however, to assist after the primary. The year 1960 offers the Republican Party of Wisconsin a

9896

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 19

new opportunity to serve the people both in the State legislature and the U.S. Congress. The programs endorsed by the convention will go a long way toward showing the voters that we are ready, willing and able to meet the economic and political problems facing State and Nation. Ours must be a party responsive to the challenges of today. With warmest regards to all my friends, I remain, Sincerely,

THE SUMMIT TRAGEDY

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the tragic events which affect the destiny of the free world, with consequences no one can foresee, are naturally absorbing the attention of all public-spirited Americans and even more particularly of those who, like ourselves, are charged with responsibility in Government.

Public opinion is still confused and uncertain as to what may be the consequences of these events. I think it useful therefore that the comments on the contemporary crisis of three well-known and distinguished columnists be brought to the attention of as wide an audience as possible, and I therefore ask unanimous consent to have these printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. The first, by Mr. Walter Lippmann, was published in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald, and is entitled "First of All." The second is by James Reston and published in this morning's New York Times, entitled "The Summit Tragedy." The third is an article written by Drew Pearson, published in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald, entitled "Ike's Hopes Crashed With U-2."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 19, 1960]

FIRST OF ALL

(By Walter Lippmann)

Amid the wreckage, and as we recover from the shock, the long work of rebuilding will have to begin. Where must it begin?

It must begin at the point where the most critical damage has been done. Where is that point? It is not in what Mr. Khrushchev said or did to us. It is in what we did to ourselves. It is that we "first did help to wound ourselves."

The wound has been made by the series of blunders on the gravest matters in the highest quarters. These blunders have not only angered the Russians and wrecked the summit conference but, much worse than all that, they have cast doubt among our allies and among our own people on our competence to lead the Western alliance on the issues of peace and war. Mr. Khrushchev's harsh and intemperate language has produced a reaction and evoked sympathy for the plight of the President. But we must have no illusions about the depth and the extent of the loss of confidence in American leadership, in the judgment, sagacity, and political competence of the Government in Washington.

This is the damage to which we must address ourselves. We are a free people, and one of the blessings of a free society is that, unlike an unfree society, it provides a way to deal with error and correct mistakes. This is to investigate, to criticize, to debate, and then to demonstrate to the people and to the world that the lessons of the fiasco have been learned and will be applied.

In a situation like ours the damage to our prestige would be irreparable if we all ral-

lied around the President and pretended to think that there was nothing seriously wrong. For that would prove to the world that the blunders will not be corrected but will be continued, and that our whole people are satisfied with bad government. It is the dissenters and the critics and the opposition who can restore the world's respect for American competence. We cannot do this by pretending that the incompetence does not exist.

These are hard words. But in what other words shall we describe the performance on Sunday night when the Secretary of Defense, who is in Paris as one of the President's advisers, ordered a worldwide alert of American combat forces? On Sunday night Mr. Macmillan and General De Gaulle were still struggling to find some way out of the affair of the spy plane. Yet this was the time chosen by the Secretary of Defense to "stage a worldwide readiness exercise" which, though not the last stage before actual war, is one of the preliminary stages to it.

Why Sunday of all days? This blunder was not the work of some forgotten colonel on a Turkish airfield. This was the work of the Secretary of Defense and of the President. The timing of the "exercise" was just a shade worse than sending off the U-2 on its perilous mission 2 weeks before the summit. The timing of the so-called exercise makes no sense whatever. For if the alert was concerned with a possible surprise attack, when in the name of common sense could there be less danger of a surprise attack on the Western World than when Mr. K. in person was in Paris?

Unhappily, too, Secretary Gates' "exercise" was just about as incompetently administered at the top as was the affair of the spy plane. This time, it appears, the top people forgot to say anything about the "exercise" to their press officers who did not know what to say, and were not even in their offices, when the public was being frightened by the "exercise."

A great government faced with a most formidable adversary, itself the leader, champion, and mainstay of the non-Communist world, cannot be conducted in such a reckless and haphazard way. That is the damage that first must be repaired before we can begin to deal with the general international wreckage, and to regain our confidence in ourselves.

[From the New York Times]

THE SUMMIT TRAGEDY—BREAKDOWN OF PARLEY SHAKES WORLD'S FAITH IN WISDOM OF TOP LEADERS

(By James Reston)

PARIS, May 18.—The tragedy of the Paris Conference, which ended tonight, is that it shook the confidence of the world in the wisdom and judgment of the two nations that hold the key to war and peace.

What troubled Paris tonight was not primarily what President Eisenhower and Premier Khrushchev would do now—which nobody knows—but the realization that the two most powerful nations in the world are also the least experienced of the great powers: both subject to the element of accident, to the ingrained habits of the past and to the whims of personal pride and caprice.

This was the conference that everyone lost. It did something no one thought possible; it outlaid the Paris Conference of 1919. After 41 years President Eisenhower, Premier Khrushchev, Prime Minister Macmillan, and President de Gaulle made Wilson, Clemenceau, Lloyd George, and Orlando look good.

It was this sense of uncertainty about the giants of the world that dominated the atmosphere in Paris today. Here was Mr. Khrushchev this afternoon in the great hall of the Palais de Chaillot shouting at the

West, paying deference to the glowering Marshal Rodion Y. Malinovsky on his left and threatening to smash American planes like an impudent cat against a wall.

EISENHOWER SILENT AND ANGRY

Here, too, was the President of the United States, angry and silent, visiting cathedrals while his allies praised his dignity and sympathized with the failure of his last great chance for an East-West accommodation, but condemned in private his absent-minded behavior on the reconnaissance flights over the Soviet Union.

Everyone was trying to be very considerate and hopeful about the mess, but all had to admit it was a mess, brought on by the unplanned blunders of Washington and the savage planned reaction of Moscow.

The general reaction to the two men was quite different. One was restrained, the other was violent; one was silent and defensive today, the other loud and offensive.

One was trying to remove misunderstandings, the other was exploiting them. But the main point was that both were shaking the world, one by accident and the other by design.

The nub of the whole thing seemed to be that both President Eisenhower and Premier Khrushchev, for different reasons, had lost control over the direction of the immense power they are supposed to govern.

The fact that the President came here and announced that he grounded all flights over the Soviet Union for the rest of his term in office is clear enough proof that, if he had been aware of the fact of these flights at this sensitive moment, he would not have approved the flight of the U-2 that was downed in Soviet territory on May 1.

CONFIDENCE IN UNITED STATES SHAKEN

The President has conceded this here in his private talks with Mr. Macmillan and General De Gaulle. They do not condemn his objective or his personal motives; in fact, he is so obviously disappointed by the melancholy turn of events since the sky-spy case that the British and French leaders are more sympathetic to him now than ever before.

Nevertheless, the lack of control and discipline over the Central Intelligence Agency by General Eisenhower, and the failure of the State Department to retain civil authority over the administration's intelligence-gathering activities have inevitably shaken the confidence of the allies in the judgment of the Nation that is their primary line of defense.

Mr. Khrushchev lost control too, apparently for different reasons. General Eisenhower led his party out of isolationism, but Mr. Khrushchev has been engaged in the even more delicate operation of fraternizing with the "capitalist enemy."

By doing so, he was going against the militant Communist philosophy that nothing matters except the class struggle. Many of his own powerful associates in the Communist Party's Central Committee apparently did not approve of the manner in which he was hobnobbing with the capitalists, and the Chinese Communists felt that this whole process of itinerant good fellowship was bound to create what they called ideological confusion within the Communist world.

So long as it appeared that Mr. Khrushchev might sweet talk the Russians into West Berlin, his jaunts were tolerated. But when this dream began to fail, and particularly when it was discovered that President Eisenhower was responsible for sending the U-2's over Soviet territory, the other leaders of the Soviet Union, it is felt here, demanded a change—with or without Mr. Khrushchev's approval.

Western leaders who were present at the Monday meeting at the Elysee Palace with Mr. Khrushchev got the impression that the Premier was nervous and perhaps even a little unhappy in his about-face role. But

MAY 19 1966

merely the excuse Mr. Khrushchev seized upon to torpedo the conference.

I grant that the Kremlin leaders, with their Iron Curtain mentality, may be ultrasensitive about incursions into the air space over the Soviet Union. Yet Mr. Khrushchev's treatment of the U-2 ~~incident~~ was cynical in the extreme. He has tried to create the impression that an end to the U-2 flights would suffice to end the problem of aerial intelligence gathering. He knows better. He knows that both his scientists and our scientists are working around the clock to develop a reconnaissance satellite. The time is drawing close when the first model of such a satellite can be launched.

Mr. President, Senators are no doubt familiar with the revolutionary importance of the reconnaissance satellite. It will be equipped with cameras of incredible precision and other information-gathering and transmitting instruments. As an information-gathering device, it will ultimately compare in efficiency to the U-2 as a modern airplane compares to Kitty Hawk.

It will eventually be possible to manufacture these reconnaissance satellites in great numbers. Their orbits will crisscross over every portion of the earth's surface.

The reconnaissance satellite means that the age of the Iron Curtain is drawing to a close. It will soon go the way of the Great Wall of China.

What are we going to do about it? Think back 15 years ago, when we first grappled with the political problems created by the atomic bomb. We took the right and proper course. We offered, subject to safeguards of elementary prudence, to place our atomic stockpile under United Nations stewardship. Only Soviet intransigence kept that program from being adopted.

There is only one military reason why we are developing the satellite—to safeguard our country and our free world partners from surprise attack. We ask nothing of other nations that we are not willing to do ourselves.

The reconnaissance satellite now gives our Nation another chance to act as a responsible member of the world community.

Mr. President, I have written to President Eisenhower, formally recommending that, subject to necessary safeguards, we offer to place our reconnaissance satellites at the service of the United Nations as a part of an international inspection program designed to prevent nuclear Pearl Harbors for any nation. If accepted, this offer would help to lay the groundwork for the beginnings of an enforceable disarmament program.

We have also respectfully suggested to the President that we now reappraise our technical program for achieving the first reconnaissance satellite, toward the end of getting it in the sky at the earliest possible date.

Mr. Khrushchev can have no rational objection to such a move. After all, the Soviet Union, with its first sputnik, was the first to fly over the air space of other nations.

A still more important point. There is now growing reason to suspect that a man may be sitting in the Soviet spaceship circling the globe at this very minute and that the Soviets may very shortly attempt to return this man—alive—to earth.

Mr. President, it is our duty to build the armaments needed for our survival. But it is also our duty to do everything within our power to put the instruments of science and technology under effective international control. One great move in this direction would be to establish an international program for guarding against surprise attacks. The reconnaissance satellite will give us a chance to start such a program. Let us

RECONNAISSANCE SATELLITES

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the summit conference is over. Its collapse has wrecked any hope of an early thawing of the cold war.

One thing is already clear. Mr. Khrushchev overplayed his hand. He left Moscow planning to split the free world asunder; he is returning to Moscow with the free world more united than before. This was the failure of a mission.

A second thing is clear: The unfortunate U-2 incident did not itself cause the collapse of the Paris meeting. It was

gence flights by U.S. aircraft into Soviet territory and the President's suspension of them and promise not to resume such flights, without extracting a compensating concession from the Soviet leader, the situation is without parallel in American history. Yet, when examined closely, it is correlated to important political occurrences in other parts of the world, including the continental United States.

Among these have been agitations at Panama, fanned by Communist mentors, for what is described as reaffirmation of Panamanian sovereignty over the Canal Zone land grant. An unfortunate statement at Panama by one of our high ranking diplomatic officials to the effect that the United States had recognized the "titular sovereignty" of Panama over the Canal Zone, whatever that is, and that Panama should have "visual evidence" of such sovereignty in the formal display of its flag on the Canal Zone, played into the hands of the international conspiracy for wresting the exclusive sovereignty control of the zone from the United States.

In view of the obvious Soviet policy of aggressive subversion in strategic areas, such as Panama, Cuba, and Indonesia, it was not difficult to foresee and to state to the House on January 13, 1960, that the pattern at Panama would supply the precedent for similar agitations with respect to Alaska, purchased in 1867 by treaty from Russia. It is indeed a sterile satisfaction to say that my predictions with respect to a vitally important question have again been fulfilled.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what is the situation in Alaska? It is common talk among people there about frequent radio broadcasts from Siberian stations across the Bering Sea urging in clear English the resumption of Soviet sovereignty over that part of the United States. But even more ominous, are persistent intelligence flights of Soviet planes over Alaska, which U.S. forces are not permitted to stop.

In Alaska today, we have a situation that combines the pattern of Panama with that of the flight over Soviet territory of the U-2 intelligence plane, which was shot down. Moreover, there have been other U.S. planes shot down in other areas.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, despite the significance of the Alaska situation the press of our country, with some minor exceptions, has been strangely silent. What is the influence that leads to such suppression of vitally significant news?

The net result of this silence could well make the United States a province of the one world of universal communism. Our safety demands that the Congress find out and remove the controls that now approach the ultimate in tyranny by denying such crucial information to the Nation.

I think I reflect the views of all peoples and all races, including those of holy Russia, when saying that they do not wish war. But war will not be prevented by abject surrenders on the part

of the United States, as some Communist leaders and their collaborators in our country appear to desire and to expect. It can be avoided only by standing up for our just rights and by effective precautions to prevent the tragedy of another Pearl Harbor.

To these ends, Mr. Speaker, our Government should call for the arrest and deportation of Soviet spies, who form a far larger fifth column here than exists in the Soviet Union. For such procedure we have as a precedent the recent firm action of little Switzerland.

Meanwhile, the people of the United States will expect the President to issue orders to our Alaska commands to protect our positions there in the same way Premier Khrushchev protects those of the Soviet Union. These orders would include instructions to challenge Soviet planes and to shoot down those that do not comply with orders to land.

PARIS CONFERENCE COLLAPSE: REALISTIC NATIONAL POLICY REQUIRED

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the complete collapse of the Paris meeting of heads of governments is now a matter of history. Following as it did the sensational disclosures of the U-2 intelligence plane incident in the heart of the Soviet Union, the Paris failure has stirred the peoples of all countries to a degree not equaled since the world-shaking crises prior to World War II.

Featured by Premier Khrushchev's stern warnings against further intelli-

SOVIET PROPOSAL TO GO BEFORE
THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under all the circumstances, the Soviet proposal to go before the United Nations has the trappings of a propa-

ganda circus. There is a serious question as to whether the Soviets are looking for a method of settling disputes or a sounding board for further propaganda.

Over the years, and through two Presidents, the United States has repeatedly sought to use the United Nations as a discussion body through which the issues that really divide the world can be resolved. The record of Soviet moves to block such action is well established.

Premier Khrushchev's appeal to the United Nations might carry greater conviction if the Soviets were to demonstrate a real willingness to negotiate on such issues as armaments control, the integrity of smaller nations, and the fate of subjugated peoples.

It is obvious that we are in for a period of heightened tensions. I am confident the United States has the internal fortitude to stand up to the problems before us. I hope that somewhere along the line the Soviet Premier and those who are behind him will realize the very real dangers into which they are now plunging the whole world.

1960

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

9981

Resolved, That the Midwest Federation of College Young Republican Clubs urges the administration to take appropriate diplomatic measures and such economic sanctions as are necessary to remedy the situation.

Whereas the ruling class of South Africa has repeatedly violated the basic human rights of the Africans: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Midwest Federation of College Young Republican Clubs go on record as supporting peaceful efforts for the establishment of basic human rights in Africa; including gradual abolishment of apartheid; but be it further

Resolved, That we are not in favor of direct or indirect intervention by the United Nations in this matter because we feel such action is a violation of the U.N. Charter: be it

Resolved, That the Midwest Federation of College Young Republican Clubs urges the Administration and the Congress of the United States to comprehensively review our foreign aid policy in view of the changing status in the world markets, our international deficit of payments, and the ability of recipient nations to handle their problems themselves; and be it further

Resolved, That foreign aid, when given, be on a loan basis wherever feasible.

Whereas the coming summit conference at Geneva may potentially influence peace in the world; and

Whereas diplomatic agreements made in the past with the U.S.S.R., such as at Yalta, were violated and in some instances completely disregarded when such action furthered the cause of world communism: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Midwest Federation of College Young Republican Clubs ask that the diplomatic leaders of the Western Nations keep the actions of the Communist leaders of the past in mind and take all precautions not to lead the free world into agreements or commitments that could be again violated by the U.S.S.R. in a manner that would better the causes of world communism.

Whereas it is in the best interests of the United States that West Germany remain a loyal partner in the NATO alliance; and

Whereas there has been expressed a doubt in European countries that the United States will maintain a strong stand on the Berlin issue: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Midwest Federation of College Young Republican Clubs urge that the United States reaffirm our belief in the strategic position of West Berlin in the NATO Alliance and our desire to protect the freedom of Berlin at all costs: Be it

Resolved, That, the Midwest Federation of College Young Republican Clubs approve the technical aid and assistance approach to the foreign aid problem as exemplified specifically by the U.S.S. Hope.

V. GOLDWATER, BARRY M.

Whereas he has rendered outstanding service in defining and clarifying the sharp difference between the Republican and Democrat parties, and

Whereas he has waged an unrelenting battle to restore freedom and dignity to the American individual: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this convention urges that Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona, be nominated for Vice President of the United States by the Republican National Convention in 1960.

VI. HEALTH AND WELFARE

Whereas the need for Federal medical assistance to our elder generation is temporary because the amount of private health insurance protecting this group has risen at a substantial rate; and

Whereas the voluntary effort at the community level is rapidly developing and expanding special facilities for the health, care of the aged; and

Whereas the cost of medical insurance provided by the Federal Government would be prohibitive; and

Whereas any health care offered to our aged by Government legislation would result in overcrowding of local hospitals and other facilities and a general deterioration of medical care: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Midwest Federation of College Young Republican Clubs go on record as opposing any attempt by the Federal Government, such as the Forand bill, to socialize medical care.

VII. LABOR POLICY

Whereas the Republican Party has fought for laws which would help labor unions become more responsible and representative institutions; and

Whereas we feel that the Landrum-Griffin Act was a step in the direction of establishing labor-management relations on a sounder basis; but

Whereas we are of the opinion that further action is needed to protect American workers in their rights: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Midwest Federation of College Young Republican Clubs go on record as favoring:

1. The right of any individual to choose his own bargaining agent without being compelled by public law or private agreement to belong to any association in order to earn a living.

2. The outlawing of all secondary boycotts and coercive blackmail picketing not covered by the Landrum-Griffin Act.

3. Adequate development of legislative safeguards to prevent any type of organization from operating in restraint of trade.

VIII. LOYALTY OATH AND DISCLAIMER AFFIDAVIT

Whereas the National Defense Education Act was created to provide for the national defense: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Midwest Federation of College Young Republican Clubs go on record as supporting Senator STYLES BRIDGES, chairman of the Republican senatorial policy committee, in his fight to preserve both the loyalty oath and disclaimer affidavit provisions of that act.

IX. NATIONAL DEFENSE AND SECURITY

Whereas we believe that this country's deterrent force is second to none, and we decry the politically unjustified attempts to generate hysteria over the alleged armed inferiority of the United States defenses; and

Whereas it is noteworthy that the same Democrat politicians who in 1956 were frightening Americans with cries of an alleged "bomber gap"—a gap which never existed—are now claiming that the United States is behind the Soviet Union in missile and nuclear capabilities; and

Whereas the public record clearly shows that the men who sold America short then are trying to sell her short today: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we favor the continued elimination of wasteful interservice competition, with greater emphasis on a more centralized and unified mission command.

We encourage the continuing strengthening of our NATO, SEATO, and other collective security alliances, with more effective military protection of the Americas through OAS.

We urge additional public educational activities by the Office of Defense and Civilian Mobilization, particularly in the areas of nationwide alerts and the need for better civilian bomb shelters and emergency needs. And being aware that the real strength of Communist subversion rests upon public apathy and ignorance, we feel that a more active job must be done by the House Un-American Activities Committee and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee; and be it further

Resolved, That it is the feeling of the Midwest Federation of College Young Republicans that sound judgment rather than dollars should be the main criterion when considering our national defense and security program.

X. NIXON, RICHARD M.

Whereas Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON has demonstrated his ability as a statesman and diplomat; and

Whereas he has been closely associated with the present administration and having this most favored position is the best qualified person to manage and deal with the present world situation; and

Whereas he has the integrity and experience necessary for national leadership: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Midwest Federation of College Young Republicans Clubs endorse the candidacy of RICHARD M. NIXON for President of the United States.

XI. PROGRAM AND PROGRESS COMMITTEE REPORT

Whereas our President Dwight D. Eisenhower has appointed a commission of outstanding Republicans to map a statement of long-range policy and objectives for the Republican Party; and

Whereas the report issued by that commission represents a published statement of farsighted constructive long-range goals; and

Whereas the report has been acclaimed and endorsed by President Eisenhower, Vice President NIXON, and by the national chairman of the Republican Party: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the Midwest Federation of College Young Republicans, commend the Percy committee for its work in establishing the policy guides and ideas contained in this report.

ADLAI STEVENSON'S CRITICISM OF THE EISENHOWER ADMINISTRATION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed, in the morning hour, for 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wish to speak a little about crowbars and sledge hammers.

Last week, in his speech at Chicago, Governor Stevenson stated that Khrushchev wrecked the summit conference; and then Mr. Stevenson added:

We handed Khrushchev the crowbar and sledge hammer to wreck the meeting.

The crowbar and the sledge hammer, according to Governor Stevenson, were the alleged blunders and mistakes.

Then followed his salute to unity, a reminder that his party also had a responsibility, an anticipation of what Republicans would say in the campaign, a recital of the Democrat duty to inform the people, and then the usual political "punch" that—

This administration has helped make successful negotiations with the Russians—negotiations that are vital to our survival—impossible so long as they are in power.

In so doing, he projected crowbars and sledge hammers right into the middle of the campaign, notwithstanding the very refreshing recitals of unity that came from the distinguished acting majority leader the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], who is a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and from the very distinguished majority

leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], and from a great many others.

Mr. President, whose crowbar did the wrecking? That is the question. According to Radio Liberty, Khrushchev knew of the reconnaissance flights in 1956. If true, why was he silent these many years? Why did he fail to raise the question at Camp David? Why did he fail to raise the question at the Press Club? Why did he fail to raise the question in the course of his tour? Why did he fail to raise the question at the closed meeting of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee?

I was in attendance at that meeting; and I asked Mr. Khrushchev quite a number of questions, and got a rather curt brushoff when we got around to the censoring of American dispatches, when Mr. Khrushchev said:

How do we know they are not all spies?

The U-2 incident was immaterial, and nothing more than a smokescreen. But I must get back to the crowbar.

On the day Khrushchev arrived in Paris, Governor Stevenson was quoted in an interview by the Paris press. It was first reported to us by William Stoneman, a competent, reliable reporter on the staff of the Chicago Daily News foreign service. Mr. Stoneman reported that in this interview Governor Stevenson made three suggestions. They were as follows, and they were headlined in the Paris papers on the day that Khrushchev arrived:

First, that he favored concessions on Berlin in return for an agreement with Russia on cessation of atomic tests.

Second, that he favored a reduction of American forces in West Berlin from 11,000 to 7,000.

I would gather from that suggestion that the distinguished former Governor of Illinois wants to close the last remaining hole in the Iron Curtain.

Third, that a disarmament accord might be sought on the basis of the Rapachi plan, under which forces would be reduced by both the East and the West in the area of central Europe.

Since then David Lawrence, in today's issue of the New York Herald Tribune, discusses the matter further under the caption, "Stevenson Is Seen Involved in Strange Circumstances." Mr. Lawrence comments at length on the matter, and then says:

The strangest episode of all, however, is the interview with Mr. Stevenson, which Soviet Premier Khrushchev read in Paris-Presse-l'Intransigeant just after his recent arrival in Paris. That interview was written by Robert Bulay, after a visit to Mr. Stevenson's home at Libertyville, Ill., where he said he spent an afternoon together with other guests.

The article with a streamer headline across the page said that Adlai Stevenson had proposed virtually a retreat from Berlin and American troop withdrawal from Europe. The published interview was a shock to Americans abroad coming as it did just a few days before the summit conference was to open.

That makes quite a picture. On the eve of the conference, the man who was twice the candidate of his party for the presidency, and in an election year, sug-

gests publicly through the Paris press just how we should make the soft approach to Mr. Khrushchev.

When a reluctant prospect for the Democrat nomination—and I suppose he is a reluctant prospect, and who shall say what might happen—shows his hand in such fashion, Mr. Khrushchev would have been a fool not to consider postponement of the conference for 6 or 8 months—that is, until after election day—on the theory that he might be dealing later with a more gentle, a more tractable, a more flexible, and a less firm President. Or could it be with a more tractable Secretary of State?

In Mr. Khrushchev's comment to Mayor George Christopher at the San Francisco dinner, he rated Mr. Stevenson "the best among U.S. politicians."

Along with all this was the suggestion by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] in Oregon that, no matter who was nominated, Governor Stevenson would be a good candidate for Secretary of State.

Did Mr. KENNEDY read Governor Stevenson's interview in the Paris press? If he did not, how did he come on the statement that Khrushchev had made in East Berlin, that for the last 7 years Chancellor Adenauer has been the Secretary of State for the United States? Adlai, and only Adlai, used that phrase, and it appears in the Paris interview.

So we get back to the question, Whose crowbar brought about the wreckage of the summit? Perhaps it would be more appropriate to say it was a stick of dynamite with a delayed action fuse. Or, since Adlai is a Navy man, we might remain in character and say it was a well-placed, well-timed torpedo that found its mark.

To make sure that all this is documented, I submit and ask unanimous consent to have included in the Record as a part of my remarks the following:

No. 1: The address in full made by Governor Stevenson to the Cook County Democrat \$100 Dinner, on Thursday, May 19.

No. 2: The dispatch by William W. Stoneman, under the caption, "Was Nikita Influenced By Adlai?"

No. 3: The press release of the American Committee for Liberation, which refers to the U-2 flights.

No. 4: The article by David Lawrence from the New York Herald Tribune, dated Monday, May 23, 1960.

No. 5: The article from the Portland Oregonian in which Senator JOHN KENNEDY stated in response to a question at St. Helen's High School, that:

Khrushchev laid down two conditions to President Eisenhower for going on with the summit meeting. One was to apologize. I think that might have been possible to do.

That is Mr. KENNEDY suggesting that the President of the United States apologize to Mr. Khrushchev. I let this amazing statement speak for itself.

No. 6: The translation of the article by Special Correspondent Robert Bulay, based on his interview with Governor Stevenson at Libertyville, Ill., and bearing a Chicago dateline, in which appear all the questions and answers, in-

cluding Governor Stevenson's statement that—

For 10 years there has not really been a Secretary of State for foreign policy. During this period, the real American Secretary of State has been German Chancellor Adenauer.

No. 7: A dispatch by Douglas Dales, under the caption "Farley Condemns Stevenson's Stand," in which Mr. Farley called upon the forthcoming Democratic National Convention to "condemn and repudiate Adlai E. Stevenson's criticism of the Eisenhower administration over the U-2 spy-plane incident."

No. 8: An article by Gould Lincoln, appearing in the Washington Star of May 21, 1960, under the caption "Would Adlai Have Banned the U-2?"

No. 9: The expression of viewpoint, much healthier and more refreshing, by the Honorable Averell Harriman, former Ambassador to the Soviet Union and former Governor of New York, which was written especially for United Press International. The article speaks for itself. I am glad to note that Mr. Harriman points out what President Eisenhower symbolizes to the Soviet people, and how enthusiastically he was received in 1945 when invited to Moscow by Premier Stalin. There was no crowbar in this.

No. 10: A declaration of confidence and support by the Western Governors Conference, adopted at Seattle, Wash., May 18, 1960, and subscribed by 12 western Governors.

Mr. President, I fancy we shall be hearing a lot more about crowbars and sledge hammers in the coming campaign if this is the line to be pursued by the opposition party.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all of these exhibits be printed as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois?

There being no objection, the exhibits were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TEXT OF ADDRESS BY ADLAI STEVENSON TO A COOK COUNTY DEMOCRATIC COMMITTEE DINNER

It appears that this year's campaign will be waged under the darkest shadows that ever hovered over the world—the mushroom clouds of a nuclear war that no one wants. This terrible danger—and how to avert it—will and should overshadow every other issue.

For the chances of a more stable world, which seemed to be brightening, have been rudely reversed by the breakdown of the summit conference in this historic week.

Premier Khrushchev wrecked this conference. Let there be no mistake about that. When he demanded that President Eisenhower apologize and punish those responsible for the spy-plane flight, he was in effect asking the President to punish himself. This was an impossible request, and he knew it.

SERIES OF BLUNDERS

But we handed Khrushchev the crowbar and the sledge hammer to wreck the meeting. Without our series of blunders, Mr. Khrushchev would not have had a pretext for making his impossible demand and wild charges. Let there be no mistake about that either.

1960

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

9983

We sent an espionage plane deep into the Soviet Union just before the summit meeting. Then we denied it. Then we admitted it. And when Mr. Khrushchev gave the President an out by suggesting that he was not responsible for ordering the flight, the President proudly asserted that he was responsible. On top of that we intimated that such espionage flights over Russia would continue. At this point if Khrushchev did not protest he would be condoning our right to spy—and how long could he keep his job that way? Next we evidently reconsidered and called off the espionage flights. But to compound the incredible, we postponed the announcement that the flights were terminated—just long enough to make it seem we were yielding to pressure, but too long to prevent Mr. Khrushchev from reaching the boiling point.

ALERT CARD NOTED

And, as if that wasn't enough, on Sunday night when there was still a chance that de Gaulle and Macmillan could save the situation, we ordered a worldwide alert of our combat forces. Is it unreasonable for suspicious Russians to think such a series of mistakes could only be a deliberate effort to break up a conference we never wanted anyway?

We Democrats know how clumsy this administration can be. We are not likely to forget the fumbles that preceded the Suez crisis on the eve of the 1956 election.

But nothing, of course, can justify Mr. Khrushchev's contemptuous conduct, especially after President Eisenhower had announced that our espionage flights had been called off. But his anger was predictable, if not his violence. How would we feel if Soviet spy planes based in Cuba were flying over Cape Canaveral and Oak Ridge? And also we could predict with certainty his efforts to use the situation to split the Western Alliance and intimidate the countries where our bases are situated.

Republican leaders are now saying that in this grave crisis we must all rally around the President in the name of national unity. Our respect for the Presidency will find us joined in salute to President Eisenhower upon his return. We resent deeply and bitterly the gross affront to the President and his Office.

NO QUESTION ABOUT UNITY

There is no question about national unity in a time of crisis. But errors must be corrected, and must not forget that the opposition party also has an obligation to our country and to our allies whose security is also involved. It is the duty of responsible opposition in a democracy to expose and criticize carelessness and mistakes, especially in a case of such national and world importance as this. We must see to it that we profit from such grave mistakes and misfortunes.

It is particularly regrettable that this happened in an election year. And we can already predict what the Republicans will tell the people in the months ahead.

They will say that President Eisenhower's patience and dignity in Paris scored a diplomatic triumph by exposing Khrushchev's insincerity.

They will say that the Russians are hoping that a "softed" Democratic President will be elected in November. They will tell the people that a vote for the candidate the Russians distrust is a vote against appeasement.

It will be our duty, it will be the duty of all thoughtful, concerned citizens to help the situation and to face the hard, inescapable facts; that this administration played into Khrushchev's hands; that if Khrushchev wanted to wreck the conference our Government made it possible; that the administration has acutely embarrassed our allies and endangered our bases; that they

have helped make successful negotiations with the Russians—negotiations that are vital to our survival—impossible so long as they are in power.

MUST SEEK UNDERSTANDING

We cannot sweep this whole sorry mess under the rug in the name of national unity. We cannot and must not. Too much is at stake. Rather, we must try to help the American people understand the nature of the crisis, to see how we got into this predicament, how we can get out of it, and how we get on with the business of improving relations and mutual confidence and building a safer, saner world in the nuclear age.

For in this age, unprecedented in human history, all of us, Americans and Russians alike, have one common enemy. The enemy is the danger of war. We must defeat the enemy together. Despite his hysterics last night, Mr. Khrushchev says he still believes in peaceful progress by negotiation. Let us hope he proves it, and let the United States come into the United Nations not content with the ordinary speeches, not content with the usual anti-Russian majority votes, but with constructive, positive, affirmative proposals to restore the hope of peace.

To those who will see nothing but Russian vice and American virtue, to those who will cry appeasement to any acknowledgment of our mistakes, I say that this is the toughest kind of commonsense. For there is no future for any of us in a spiraling arms race propelled by mounting suspicion and distrust on both sides. The fact that Khrushchev seems to have lost his temper in Paris makes it all the more important that we not lose ours—or our heads.

[From the Daily News Foreign Service]

WAS NIKITA INFLUENCED BY ADLAI?

(By William H. Stoneman)

PARIS.—A startling statement by Soviet Premier Khrushchev expressing hope that he could do more business with one of Ike's successors than with Ike himself is being connected by imaginative Europeans with an interview recently given to a French newspaperman by Adlai Stevenson.

In an interview published by the Paris-Presse-Transatlantique on Saturday—the day of Khrushchev's arrival here—Stevenson was quoted as willing to make concessions to the Russians on a number of points.

One of Stevenson's alleged statements which startled and disturbed members of the American delegation to the summit indicated that he favored concessions on Berlin in return for an agreement with Russia on cessation of atomic tests.

One concession he was quoted as favoring was reduction of American forces in West Berlin from 11,000 to 7,000.

Of more importance was his suggestion that a disarmament accord might be sought on the basis of the Rapacki plan under which forces would be reduced by both the East and West in the area of central Europe.

This has been opposed by the Western Powers because it might involve retirement of American forces from Europe.

Stevenson was quoted as being willing to face this eventuality.

"I think Europeans—Germans, French and British—should be in a position to defend themselves in Europe," he was quoted as saying.

KHRUSHCHEV KEPT 4-YEAR SILENCE ON U.S. FLIGHTS; SOVIET PREMIER REJECTED PROTEST TO UNITED STATES IN 1956

(News release from American Committee for Liberation)

NEW YORK.—When did Nikita Khrushchev first learn of the U.S. U-2 flights over the Soviet Union? The question assumes impor-

ance in view of the Soviet Premier's temper tantrum in Paris on Monday.

According to Radio Liberty, Khrushchev himself has stated the first knew of the U.S. reconnaissance flights in 1956. Moreover, by his own admission, the Soviet Premier refused at the time to lodge a protest with the U.S. Government. Instead, he said he ordered improvements in Soviet rocket power.

It was a Soviet rocket which, according to Khrushchev, brought down the highflying Lockheed U-2 piloted by Francis Gary Powers near Sverdlovsk last May 1.

"The record thus indicates that Mr. Khrushchev first learned about the U.S. overflights almost 4 years before he raised the issue in an obvious effort to torpedo the Paris summit conference," said Radio Liberty. "The question naturally arises as to why the Soviet Premier waited 4 years to protest."

Radio Liberty also noted that it was during those 4 years—following the alleged 1956 plane episode—that Nikita Khrushchev roamed the world as a salesman of "peaceful coexistence." Later, after he succeeded in being invited to the United States, he began expounding the so-called spirit of Camp David.

"There is nothing on the record to suggest that Mr. Khrushchev ever brought the subject of these flights to President Eisenhower's attention during his U.S. visit last fall," said Radio Liberty. "Why—if they pained him so deeply—he waited 4 years to finally broach the subject in Paris on Monday should be of considerable interest to the peoples of the Soviet Union, to whom peace is as important as it is to the peoples of the free world. Is it possible Mr. Khrushchev had other considerations in mind when he decided to torpedo the summit conference?"

Radio Liberty, which is the voice of former Soviet citizens, is providing thorough coverage of the Paris summit developments in its around-the-clock broadcasts to all parts of the Soviet Union in Russian and 17 other languages from powerful transmitters in Western Europe and the Far East.

According to Gene King, U.S. programming chief of the network, Radio Liberty is placing special emphasis on news developments which official Soviet communications media appear to be ignoring. For example, President Eisenhower's announcement that the United States was not going to resume survey flights over the U.S.S.R. was not immediately reported by Soviet press and radio.

"We are also transmitting balanced accounts of world reactions to the latest developments in Paris," Mr. King declared. "We are fully aware of the Soviet citizens' desire to be fully informed on matters which concern them as much as they do us."

According to Radio Liberty, a study of Khrushchev's recent speeches indicates that he referred to three specific U.S. flights over Soviet territory. The first one apparently occurred on July 2, 1956; the second on April 9, 1960; and the third, Francis Powers' ill-fated flight on May 1, 1960.

The July 2, 1956, flight was disclosed by Khrushchev at a reception in the Czechoslovak Embassy in Moscow last May 9. According to the text provided by TASS, the official press agency, this is what the Soviet Premier said:

"I shall say further, when Twining, the then Chief of Staff of the U.S. Air Force, arrived here we welcomed him as a guest and entertained him. He left our country by air and the next day he sent a plane flying at great altitude into our country. This plane flew as far as Kiev."

"The question arose: Should we protest? I proposed that no protest should be lodged. Only an animal might act like Twining, which, eating at one place, might do its unpleasant business there. From such behavior, we drew the conclusion: To improve rockets, to improve fighters. Our fighters

can fly as high as 28,000 meters. But the difficulties of a fighter are that though it can rise high, it is not so easy and simple to find the target in the air: a plane in the air is like a needle in the ocean.

"But the rocket finds its targets itself. This is the advantage of the rocket and we made use of it."

The record shows that Gen. Nathan F. Twining arrived in Moscow on June 23, 1956, for what the then Air Force Chief of Staff later termed an 8-day "controlled" inspection of some Soviet air and military installations. The day after his arrival, he later reported, he attended a Moscow party tendered by the Defense Ministry on Soviet Air Force Day. At the party, Khrushchev drunkenly insulted the United States, British, French, and West German air officials present while Nikolai Bulganin, then the Soviet Premier, vainly shouted, "Shut up."

General Twining left the Soviet Union on July 1, 1956. According to Khrushchev, the following day an American plane "flying at great altitude . . . flew as far as Kiev," the capital of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, about 500 miles southwest of Moscow and about 600 miles north of Turkey. Khrushchev gave no further details.

Last May 5, in his speech before the Supreme Soviet, Khrushchev dramatically announced that a U.S. plane, which had violated Soviet airspace on May 1—May Day—had been shot down by a Soviet rocket. But he also disclosed this:

"Previously, an aggressive act was committed by the United States of America on the 9th of April 1960. A U.S. aircraft invaded the airspace of our country from the direction of Afghanistan. Naturally, no person of commonsense could think or suspect that this violation was carried out by Afghanistan, a country which is friendly toward us. We are convinced that this aircraft belonged to the United States and was evidently based somewhere on the territory of Turkey, Iran, or Pakistan.

"When this invasion occurred, some of our comrades raised the question as to whether the United States should be warned. We exchanged views within the Government and decided not to take any special measures, not to write notes or memorandums because from previous experience we knew that this leads to virtually nothing. We then gave a stern warning to our military, especially those who are directly responsible for the aerial defense of the country, that they must act resolutely and not permit the invasion of our airspace by foreign planes to go unpunished.

"The American military evidently liked the impunity which they experienced on April 9, and they decided to repeat their aggressive act. For this purpose they selected May Day, the most solemn occasion for our people and for the working people of all countries."

In his May 9 remarks at the Czechoslovak Embassy, Khrushchev returned to the April 9 episode. "Even now," he said, "this fight is denied in the United States. In this case the thief is: If the thief is not caught, he is no thief. But this time we caught the thief and now the whole world knows about it.

"The reconnaissance plane should have been brought down on April 9, too. But our military, to put it mildly, let a chance slip by. And we, as one says, took them to task for it. On May 1 the reconnaissance plane was shot down. The military splendidly coped with the task when the opponent grew bold."

[From the New York Herald Tribune, May 23, 1960]

STEVENSON IS SEEN INVOLVED IN "STRANGE CIRCUMSTANCES"

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, May 22.—Does Nikita Khrushchev want to see Adlai Stevenson elected

President of the United States in November so that he can negotiate a deal at the next summit conference?

Does Mr. Khrushchev hope that Mr. Stevenson, if not nominated, will be considered for the post of Secretary of State in a Democratic administration, as Senator KENNEDY hinted the other day?

Why was Mr. Stevenson, in an interview published in Paris a week ago Sunday quoted as favoring an Allied retreat on the Berlin problem?

Why did Mr. Stevenson last Thursday night tell a political dinner meeting in Chicago that the administration has "helped make successful negotiations with the Russians—negotiations that are vital to our survival—impossible so long as they are in power?"

A STRANGE SEQUENCE

These questions are prompted by a strange sequence of circumstances. Thus on March 9 last the New York Times printed a United Press International dispatch from Moscow which read:

"Soviet Premier Khrushchev has his own opinions about the U.S. Democratic Party's Presidential possibilities, he revealed tonight. He put Adlai Stevenson at the top of his list in comments to Mayor George Christopher of San Francisco at a dinner. Mr. Khrushchev's rating of the Democrats:

"Mr. Stevenson: the best among U.S. politicians.

"Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts: able, but some reservations about his youthfulness.

"Senator STUART SYMINGTON, of Missouri: he's a good man."

No other Presidential aspirants were mentioned, not even Senator HUMPHREY, who had once participated in a marathon conference of several hours with the Soviet Premier. Mr. Stevenson also conferred at length with Mr. Khrushchev in Moscow and wrote articles about him, but they did not contain any of the sting that the Minnesota Senator included in his published remarks.

DIPLOMACY RULE IGNORED

Mr. Stevenson, therefore, apparently is the favorite of Mr. Khrushchev, who has brushed aside the old rule of diplomacy that a foreign government must not interfere in the political campaigns of another country. The Soviet Premier evidently thinks Mr. Stevenson, as the titular head of the Democratic Party, speaks for it.

But James A. Farley, former Postmaster General in the cabinet of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt and a former chairman of the Democratic National Committee, has just issued a statement urging the Democratic Party to repudiate Mr. Stevenson's speech of last Thursday night. Mr. Farley said in part:

"The unwarranted attack of Mr. Adlai E. Stevenson on the President's conduct of the summit negotiations, in my opinion, in no way represents the thinking of the Democratic Party. . . . In his few remaining weeks as titular spokesman of the Democratic Party has indicated every reason why the Democratic Party in convention should select a spokesman who speaks for it in fact. I can think of no more effective way of doing so than by a unanimous resolution of condemnation and repudiation of his absurd speech in Chicago as representing the views of the Democratic Party."

HIS TALK OF RETREAT

The strangest episode of all, however, is the interview with Mr. Stevenson which Soviet Premier Khrushchev read in "Paris-Press L'Intransigeant" just after his recent arrival in Paris. That interview was written by Robert Boulay after a visit to Mr. Stevenson's home at Libertyville, Ill., where he said he spent an afternoon, together with other guests. The article, with a streamer headline across the page, said that Adlai Stevenson had proposed virtually a retreat

from Berlin and American troop withdrawal from Europe. The published interview was a shock to Americans abroad, coming as it did just a few days before the summit conference was to open. Evidently Mr. Khrushchev read it carefully, because in his own speech at East Berlin last Friday he paraphrased one of the points in the interview to charge that Chancellor Adenauer had succeeded "in worming his way to the post of Secretary of State of the United States."

Mr. Boulay, in his interview, quotes Mr. Stevenson as having said:

"For 10 years there has not really been a Secretary of State for American foreign policy. During that period the real American Secretary of State has been German Chancellor Adenauer."

ON REDUCING TROOPS

In other parts of the same interview, Mr. Stevenson is quoted as favoring American concessions, such as a substantial decrease in allied troops in West Berlin. He is reported to have declared also that he could foresee in the future the pulling of American forces out of Europe. When asked whether there would be a change in American foreign policy after the November elections, Mr. Stevenson is quoted as having said: "There will be important changes in American foreign policy."

Mr. Stevenson last Tuesday denied ever having given any interview at all to any Paris newspaper. But he issued a statement to the Chicago Daily News the next day admitting that he had talked with Robert Boulay but calling the published interview incorrect. He said it did not represent his views and that "the most charitable explanation of such irresponsibility, presumption, and discourtesy is that his English was poor and my French no better."

In Paris, however, Americans who know Mr. Boulay say he writes and talks English very well and is a reliable reporter. Just what did Mr. Stevenson really say to Mr. Boulay? Maybe all this is something for Democrats in Congress to include in their investigation of recent events. For there is no doubt that an appeasement faction exists today inside the Democratic party, and certainly Mr. Stevenson's speech—just 4 days before the all important debate at the United Nations Security Council—helped to wreck bipartisan unity in this country.

[From the Portland Oregonian]

KENNEDY SAYS SOFTER U-2 STANCE MIGHT HAVE SAVED SUMMIT TALKS

(By Mervin Shoemaker)

If Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, were President he might apologize to Soviet Premier Khrushchev for the U-2 spy incident, but the Pope would keep his hands out of U.S. governmental affairs.

The Democratic presidential primary candidate made these points Wednesday, a day of appearances spanning St. Helens and Oregon City which ended with a campaign-culminating rally at Benson Tech High School in Portland.

In Friday's election he is matched against Oregon Senator WAYNE L. MORSE, who is campaigning actively, and Senators STUART SYMINGTON, of Missouri, and LYNDON B. JOHNSON, who are not appearing in the State. Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, will have his name on the ballot, but he has withdrawn from the contest.

It was at St. Helens High School, following a breakfast meeting for which he arrived too late, that KENNEDY spoke for a degree of mollification of Khrushchev in answering a question on how he would have reacted to the Soviet Premier's attack in Paris.

POSSIBILITY SEEN

"Khrushchev laid down two conditions to President Eisenhower for going on with the summit meeting," said KENNEDY. "One was to apologize. I think that might have been possible to do. The other was to put on trial

1960

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

9985

and punish those responsible for the U-2 flight. That couldn't be done. The men involved were acting under orders."

Later KENNEDY modified the word "apologize," and said the President might "express regret."

KENNEDY told several audiences during the day that he particularly criticizes the timing of the U-2 flight such a short while before the scheduled summit meeting, "letting the risk of war hang on the possibility of an engine failure."

Throughout Wednesday—at high school, supermarket, and industrial plant—KENNEDY used a defense against attacks on his Catholic faith that apparently was developed after his mid-April visit to Oregon.

He is telling audiences that he "swore an oath to God" to uphold the Constitution when he entered Congress, and that the President takes the same oath. The Constitution, he points out, provides for separation of church and state.

When KENNEDY says he would not let the Pope interfere with his duties as president, there is more behind the statement than an Irish Catholic's independence. The Pope, it follows naturally, would be asking him to violate an "oath to God."

KENNEDY says he doesn't think the Pope would interfere with him as president, any more than he does with Charles de Gaulle in France and Konrad Adenauer in West Germany.

MILL VISITED

The candidate toured the Crown Zellerbach paper mill at West Linn, and a sampling of Democratic workmen opinion here brought nothing of comfort to MORSE, SYMINGTON, and JOHNSON.

Of 15 men in a lunchroom which KENNEDY had visited, 10 were Democrats, and 7 of them held up a hand to signify he favors KENNEDY for the nomination. None responded to a call for a show of hands by MORSE supporters.

Random Democrats at the papermill, separated by a sprinkling of Republicans—Leroy Saulsbury, 41, Milwaukee, a millworker, and Art Goldade, 33, West Linn, a pipefitter—were mostly for KENNEDY.

One man asked: "What's wrong with MORSE?" He got no answer.

There is a small chill for Republicans in one reaction to these questions, which came from Richard Buse, 33, a millwright.

His wife likes KENNEDY. She is a Democrat and a Catholic. But Buse likes KENNEDY, too. He's going to vote for him if he gets the nomination. Buse is a Lutheran and a Republican.

There was another party line-crossing incident at Gateway Shopping Center, where a long queue of persons followed KENNEDY from shop to shop in the rain.

A girl in a barber shop was a Democrat. She's for KENNEDY.

"Most of us in here are Republicans," said one of several men present, "but we're going to vote for KENNEDY in the fall."

KENNEDY got unusual support from a fellow Democrat in another Wednesday incident, one which dramatized the widening Democratic Party breach occasioned by the election campaign.

At a meeting of the East Multnomah County Democratic Women's Forum, MORSE, the speaker, vigorously criticized KENNEDY, and KENNEDY was defended by State Senator Monroe Sweetland, Milwaukee, a member of Kennedy's committee. The unusual part is that Sweetland is a candidate for Democratic nomination for secretary of state, and a candidate for major office does not often expose himself to the enemies of any other candidate.

NO TAX CUT SEEN

In the question period at Sandy Union High School KENNEDY was asked if he would favor increasing the income tax personal exemption from \$600 to \$800.

"In a dangerous time, and we stand on the razor's edge," he answered, "I don't think we can have any tax reduction."

In his Benson Tech speech KENNEDY criticized the Republican administration for its "record of failure" in natural resource development.

Nearly 1,800 persons filled the Benson auditorium nearly to capacity to hear KENNEDY, who bore down hard on significance of the Oregon primary, again contending that Democrats should not "waste their vote" on a candidate not seriously in the running for President—meaning MORSE.

KENNEDY was introduced by Representative EDITH GREEN, Portland.

TRANSLATION OF ARTICLE BY SPECIAL CORRESPONDENT ROBERT BOULAY

I passed an afternoon with Adlai Stevenson at his farm at Libertyville, 80 kilometers from Chicago. This is the man who could be the next President of the United States. Despite the fact that he has already failed twice against Eisenhower, he still has a chance. Until now, Stevenson has repeated that he was not a candidate. But when interrogated on what he would do if drafted, he replied that he was not a deserter. And having spent 4 hours with Stevenson and several of his friends I have the definite impression that the lawyer-farmer of Libertyville has not abandoned hope of succeeding Eisenhower. In any case he is certainly aiming at becoming Secretary of State if a Democratic candidate other than himself were elected next year.

It was the Saturday of Easter. Stevenson had just returned from a study trip of South America. Tanned, a little overweight, smiling, he nevertheless appeared to me rather nervous. He had just finished lunch in the company of his two sons and daughter-in-law, his grandchildren and the British economist, Barbara Ward. Stevenson moved from one to the other, offering candies, moving the same book around three times, and straightening out the coffee table.

Everyone then left for a tour of the property. Stevenson lent boots to his visitors and himself ensuring that everything was properly taken care of. For an hour and a half he showed us his fields, his sheep, his horses, and the river which was slowly draining off his flooded fields. In his corduroy suit, bareheaded, a scarf around his neck, he was the typical American gentleman farmer.

We returned to the house at 5 o'clock. Adlai Stevenson helped his grandchildren look for Easter eggs and gifts which he had hidden himself. He was more relaxed. Tea was served. Stevenson then invited me to follow him into his office and I never would have believed that he was about to speak to me as he did.

Question. What, according to you, Mr. Stevenson, is the most important question in the political world today?

Answer. The suspension of atomic tests—this is a prime question.

Question. Can it be achieved?

Answer. It must be possible to reach agreement through mutual concessions.

Question. I take it that you refer to agreement with precise control—inspection?

Up till now the Russians have not accepted the minimum inspection formula proposed to them by the Western Powers.

Answer. Naturally, an agreement with inspection * * * But I repeat to you that an agreement must be possible. This problem of atomic tests must be considered as absolute priority. With mutual concessions * * *

Question. Does this problem appear to you of such importance as to justify concessions on other matters?

Answer. Yes certainly.

Question. Does this mean that the Western Powers should make concessions on the German problem?

Answer. Yes certainly.

Question. On Berlin?

Answer. Yes.

I was surprised and persisted—

Question. Do you establish a connection between atomic agreement and Germany and more particularly Berlin?

Answer. There is no connection. But an atomic agreement is basic and justifies concessions on other matters. Since you mention Berlin incidentally, the present situation cannot be maintained.

WHY 11,000

Question. But the Western Powers are not the petitioners in Berlin. It is the Russians who seem to wish to force the Western Powers to leave Berlin?

Answer. Mr. Boulay, the present situation in Berlin cannot be maintained. Strategically, the presence of 11,000 American soldiers is meaningless * * *.

Question. Must I understand that you are prepared to accept a reduction of American forces in Berlin?

Answer. Yes. * * * One could have for instance 7,000.

Question. Why 7,000 rather than 11,500? Would you accept 5,000, or 3,000, or none at all?

Answer. Yes, but not now, later.

(I once again expressed surprise, and asked Mr. Stevenson to explain himself more fully.)

Question. Do you believe it is possible to take the political and moral risk of such a decision?

Answer. Mr. Boulay, do not be surprised. All I am telling you, I have already said and written several times.

(This explanation surprised me for to the best of my knowledge Mr. Stevenson has never gone so far or been so precise in the direction of seeking an East-West agreement.)

I WAS AT BERLIN

Question. Do you appreciate what would be the reaction of the Berliners and of the Europeans, of the Germans, of the French, and perhaps even the English and others, and even the Americans? Do you think that—

(My host interrupted.)

Answer. Mr. Boulay, I have been in Berlin several times; I know the situation.

(I permitted myself the following answer):

"Mr. Stevenson, I have also been in Berlin. Less often than you perhaps, but perhaps for a longer period. I remained for 5 weeks. I saw Berlin, even both Berlins; I have seen and listened to the Berliners. I have seen and listened to the refugees * * * the refugees whose number I believe has not diminished, on the contrary during recent weeks. Do you really think one can leave 2 million West Berliners 'alone'?"

Answer. I believe that one must first arrive at an agreement which will guarantee free access between West Berlin and the Federal Republic.

RUSSIAN GUARANTEES

Question. But how?

Answer. An agreement must be reached with Russian guarantees.

Question. The experience of the last 10 years does not encourage any optimism on what you refer to as "Russian guarantees."

Answer. That is true, but a change is possible in the future. The agreement must be sought and a solution may be found.

(Mr. Stevenson then spoke to me of the necessity and of the possibility of reducing Soviet pressure on Eastern Europe, particularly by a withdrawal, more or less substantial, of Moscow's military forces. He cited particularly as a happy precedent the Austrian Peace Treaty. I pointed out that if it is true that the Russians withdrew militarily from Austria, as did the Western Powers, they did so from a country where the political power was not held by the Com-

munists. The problem for the Soviets is not only to withdraw such-and-such military force from such-and-such country, but to envisage the strategic consequences, and above all the political consequences of even a localized withdrawal. The Russians must fear the consequences for the political power of the Communists in any Iron Curtain country as well as the example which would be furnished to other Iron Curtain countries. (Mr. Stevenson admitted the great difficulties, but maintained a relative optimism. He insisted in telling me that he believed a sort of political decompression might be possible in the countries behind the Iron Curtain.)

GI, GO HOME

Question. Do you believe, therefore, that an agreement can be reached on European disarmament?

Answer. I believe that the Rapacki¹ plan could serve as a basis for discussion.

Question. Your answer surprises me. Up to the present the Western Powers, and especially the Americans, have always opposed the Rapacki plan which is considered by the Atlantic Powers as the beginning of the neutralization of Europe. This policy could be summarized by the formula "G.I. Go Home." Do you really envisage the withdrawal of American forces from Europe?

Answer. Yes, in the future.

Question. You have just made, Mr. Stevenson, a very important answer. Does this mean that Europe would have to provide for its own defenses alone?

Answer. I believe that the Europeans—Germans, French, English, etc.—must be in a position to defend themselves in Europe.

Question. Do you believe, then, that the Americans should put atomic weapons at the disposal of European forces?

Answer. This could be discussed.

(During the rest of the conversation Mr. Stevenson gave me no further definition on this point. He nevertheless reminded me that in the past, he had said and repeated, especially to General de Gaulle, that in his opinion, European forces should concern themselves only with conventional weapons, the Americans being alone to have at their disposal atomic weapons.)

ADENAUER—U.S. SECRETARY OF STATE

Question. Will there be a change in American foreign policy after the election?

Answer. There will be important changes in American foreign policy.

(I persisted.)

Question. Mr. Stevenson, you told me there will be important changes after the elections. Would you repeat this? Do you think there will be changes regardless of the results of the elections?

(Mr. Stevenson slams the table with the palm of his hand to confirm.)

Answer. Definitely yes; there will be major changes whatever the results of the election.

(Mr. Stevenson goes on, while severely criticizing the decisions of Foster Dulles and those decisions which followed, and this is his categorical conclusion.)

For 10 years there has not really been a Secretary of State for American foreign policy. During this period the real American Secretary of State has been German Chancellor Adenauer.

DAINGEROUS WORDS

(I prepared to leave.)

Goodby, Mr. Stevenson. Thank you for your hospitality. I may see you at the summit conference. Not the next but perhaps the following.

¹ The Polish plan referred to as "Rapacki" from the name of its author provides principally for a partial European disarmament dealing with the production and stockpiling of nuclear weapons.

Mr. Stevenson, while appearing very satisfied with my polite reference, answered me "Oh no." But I sensed in his voice that he had not lost hope of some participating in the discussions between the Big Four as President of the United States, or at least as successor to Mr. Herter, or, more exactly, Chancellor Adenauer.

But on the basis of what he said to me, how could he find enough votes to be elected to the Democratic Convention if he holds to these statements? If a Democrat other than he were elected, could he really choose Stevenson as Secretary of State if Stevenson holds himself strictly to his statements of this Saturday of Easter?

FARLEY CONDEMNS STEVENSON STAND—ASAILS SPEECH ON SUMMIT—SAYS HIS NOMINATION WOULD BE DISASTROUS

(By Douglas Dales)

James A. Farley assailed Adlai E. Stevenson yesterday for his criticism of the Eisenhower administration over the collapse of the summit conference.

He warned the Democratic Party that the nomination of Mr. Stevenson for the Presidency would be disastrous.

The former Democratic National Chairman, in a caustic statement, charged that the party's standard bearer in 1952 and 1956 was using the failure of the summit meeting as a vehicle to promote a third nomination for himself.

The basis of his attack was Mr. Stevenson's speech Thursday at a party gathering in Chicago in which he declared that it was the obligation of the Democrats, as the opposition party, to expose and criticize any carelessness and mistakes of the Eisenhower administration.

As Mr. Farley directed his fire at the party's titular head, the Stevenson-for-President Committee of New York increased its activities with an advertising campaign to obtain support for Mr. Stevenson. Scores of volunteers were out in the city and suburbs, gathering signatures to petitions urging Mr. Stevenson's nomination.

Mr. Farley said he was impelled, as a matter of honesty and in furtherance of national unity, to reject Mr. Stevenson's thesis that the administration had furnished Premier Khrushchev with the "sledge hammer and crowbar" to wreck the summit conference.

"On the contrary," he said, "it occurs to me that Mr. Stevenson is attempting to use the incident to 'sledge hammer and crowbar' another disastrous nomination for himself as the Apostle of Appeasement out of the Democratic Party."

Meanwhile, the Republican National Committee criticized the Chicago speech as "reckless" and declared that Mr. Stevenson was falling "like a ton of bricks for the Khrushchev line."

The statement by Mr. Farley, who often voices the views of the conservative wing of the Democratic Party in the State, foreshadowed the possibility of a major division in the party on the question of foreign policy as a campaign issue.

Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt endorsed Mr. Stevenson's speech at a news conference here Friday. And a substantial group of Democrats in the House of Representatives have framed a series of questions for the Republicans on the U-2 plane incident and other developments on the eve of the Paris summit meeting.

UNWARRANTED ATTACK

Mr. Farley, terming Mr. Stevenson's speech an "unwarranted attack" on the President's conduct of the summit negotiations, said Mr. Stevenson did not represent the thinking of the Democratic Party.

Mr. Farley said that for Mr. Stevenson to say that the President had provided the tools to wreck the conference "indicates to me

that Mr. Stevenson continues to be as misinformed on the facts as he is infatuated with his own writing style."

"It is my experience," the former party leader said, "that adroit phrasemaking does not necessarily indicate sound policymaking, a view which I find fortified by the rejection of Mr. Stevenson on two occasions by the American electorate."

Mr. Stevenson was particularly out of his field, Mr. Farley said, in criticizing the President's calling of a military alert on the eve of the Paris meeting. Recalling that the attack on Pearl Harbor had occurred immediately after negotiations with the Japanese mission had broken off in Washington, he said:

"I feel that the most felicitous use of the language, even Mr. Stevenson's, would be totally inadequate to explain away the enormity of a magnified Pearl Harbor, in the event of a surprise Soviet attack. If Mr. Stevenson is suggesting that the Commander in Chief should refer all measures of defense to Mr. Stevenson before issuing orders to adequately protect the country, the idea is both impractical and unconstitutional."

CHINA SUGGESTION NOTED

Mr. Farley's reference to Mr. Stevenson as an "apostle of appeasement" was based in part on the suggestion last September by Mr. Stevenson that the United States should cease leading the "anti-admission" lobby against Communist China at the United Nations.

"It is part of Mr. Stevenson's appealing, if adolescent, naivete in international affairs," the statement continued, "that it appears not to occur to him that the admission of Red China by the United Nations would establish another Red spy nest in New York City under full diplomatic protection."

Mr. Farley said that during his recent travels in the Far East, heads of government had insisted to him that the slightest wavering in the country's policy of nonrecognition of Communist China "would result in a worldwide diplomatic disaster for the cause of freedom, not second to an ignominious surrender of Berlin."

Mr. Stevenson has given the National Convention every reason to select a spokesman "who speaks for it in fact," Mr. Farley said, continuing:

"I can think of no more effective way of doing so than by a unanimous resolution of condemnation and repudiation of his absurd speech in Chicago as representing the views of the Democratic Party. As a former National Chairman and as one who has been proud to be a Democrat for over 50 years, I shall call upon all Democrats to keep the symbol of our party the Democratic mule and not Mr. Stevenson's umbrella."

Mr. Stevenson, who left Chicago for New York late yesterday afternoon could not be reached for comment.

[From the Washington Star, May 21, 1960]

WOULD ADLAI HAVE BANNED THE U-2?

(By Gould Lincoln)

Adlai Stevenson's blast at President Eisenhower and the administration's handling of the U-2 intelligence flights over Russia raises some interesting questions—while at the same time thrusting an issue into the political campaign, with Mr. Stevenson as its first and perhaps principal spokesman.

Among the questions raised by the titular leader of the Democratic Party, who has been called a willing candidate for a third presidential nomination—if he can be drafted—is the following: Would Mr. Stevenson, had he been President during the last 4 years, have banned U-2 intelligence flights over Russian territory? These flights have been called by men intimately connected with the security of the United States and the free

1960

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

9987

world not only essential but of great value.

Second: Is Mr. Stevenson in any way denying that we should seek information regarding the intentions and the strength of a potential enemy—particularly during a period of constant sabre rattling and threats of destruction of the United States by Soviet Premier Khrushchev and other leading Russian Communists?

This is a subject which Mr. Stevenson has not thoroughly discussed in his comments so far. But it is one that, should he be nominated by the Democratic Party, he will be asked many times, and will have to answer. It is obvious he cannot have it both ways. Mr. Khrushchev in his recent widely publicized press conference in Paris, when he torpedoed the summit conference, said in answer to a question that he had known for some time of the U-2 flights over Russia; that he knew all about them at the time he visited the United States and President Eisenhower at Camp David. If he did, his restraint—he did not mention these flights to President Eisenhower in their intimate conversations—was in remarkable contrast to his outbursts in Moscow on May Day and in Paris.

RESPONSIBILITY OF PRESIDENT

Had Mr. Stevenson been President he would have been told by the country's defenders in all probability that it was of vital importance to rise above the Iron Curtain and obtain as much information as possible regarding Russia's military strength and her intentions, so that this country could be alerted before a surprise attack. Presumably Mr. Stevenson would have agreed to this form of espionage. He would have known, as did President Eisenhower, the need for our security in the face of the constant threat of Soviet attack. He would have known, too, of the wideflung espionage carried on—and with much success—by the Soviet, both in this country and in the rest of the world.

Nevertheless, Mr. Stevenson has undertaken to thrust this whole subject of intelligence work for national security into the political campaign. Another question rises: Have Mr. Stevenson's charges against the President and his handling of the use of these intelligence flights tended to create a picture in Russian minds and in the minds of our allies of a divided America? The titular leader of the Democratic Party was careful in his Chicago speech to denounce the demands of Mr. Khrushchev for an apology from President Eisenhower because of the U-2 flights and for the punishment of those responsible for launching them. He was careful to say that this is no time for America to be divided. But what he said, taken as a whole, may well be interpreted as showing a serious division among the people of America. It may be interpreted as a back-handed apology.

Certainly, Mr. Stevenson seems to have indicated that the country must get rid of the Republicans and Mr. Eisenhower and all his works if the United States is to be able in the future to negotiate with Soviet Russia and the Communist world. This, in a measure, is exactly what Mr. Khrushchev declared in Paris. If Mr. Stevenson intended to exhibit himself as a better negotiator for a peaceful world, he has not given an impression that he would be a stronger one.

SPEECH POLITICAL

Mr. Stevenson in Chicago was addressing a Democratic political rally, a Cook County fund raising dinner. His speech was a political speech and so intended. The issue of the U-2 flights, their handling, and all other implications, so far as Mr. Stevenson is concerned, are firmly in the campaign. It may be that other Democratic leaders will follow a similar course. The question naturally arises: Will this issue gain votes for the Dem-

ocratic nominee for President—whether Mr. Stevenson, Senator KENNEDY or another? Will Mr. Stevenson picture the President as a wrecker of the Paris Summit Conference—or won't he? It would be a difficult task to put that across in the minds of Americans, in view of Mr. Khrushchev's exhibition at Paris. In his Chicago speech, Mr. Stevenson called Mr. Khrushchev the wrecker of the conference. But he said Mr. Eisenhower had placed the crowbar in Mr. Khrushchev's hands by ineptness, by contradictory statements emanating from this Government. This raises the question: Would Mr. Stevenson, as President, have denied the whole business of the U-2 flights, have disclaimed any responsibility for them?

The American people have learned over the years that President Eisenhower is devoted to peace and the preservation of a peaceful world. He, however, has never been an advocate of peace at any price. He has insisted that the country be prepared and strong and informed in order to forestall or prevent Communist attack. Now he is charged by Mr. Khrushchev with seeking war, with a desire to prevent a successful summit conference. Mr. Stevenson would not have the American people believe any such thing. His contention is that the President has been stupid—more stupid than a Democratic President would have been. That, however, is still to be proved.

RUSSIANS WANT TO HEAR PEACE MESSAGE FROM IKE

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Probably no living American has known Russia and the Russians over as many years as Averell Harriman, former New York Governor and ambassador to the Soviet Union from 1943 to 1946. He returned several months ago from a 6-week tour of the country during which he had a long series of conversations with Nikita Khrushchev and leading government officials.)

(By Averell Harriman)

The success or failure of the summit conference hangs largely on the decisions of one man—Nikita Khrushchev. But even Khrushchev, powerful as he is, cannot prevent President Eisenhower's visit to the Soviet Union from being a tremendous success, and of lasting benefit to our country.

To the Russian people, Dwight D. Eisenhower is not just a President of the United States. He is the supreme commander of the allied forces who with the Soviet armies fought to victory over the ruthless Nazi invaders. During the war his reputation was built up by the Soviet Government, through the press and other ways, as a great ally and friend of the Soviet Union. In July 1945, Stalin invited him to visit Moscow, and he was given a hero's welcome.

He stayed with me at the Embassy, and I vividly recall his reception by the people, particularly at the Dynamo football game. The 80,000 spectators who jammed the stands raised the sky with their applause when he and Marshal Zhukov stood up to take a bow, with their arms around each other's shoulders.

Then we were invited to review the youth parade in Red Square. The participants, 100,000 strong, from all over the Soviet Union, saw him standing with Stalin and Zhukov on top of Lenin's tomb.

Last year, when I visited the Soviet Union, wherever I went—Moscow, or central Asia, or the wilds of Siberia—people talked to me about peace, expressed their fear of war, and asked why we planned to attack them.

It is hard for us Americans to believe that the Russian people think the threat of war comes from us. But the propaganda has been constantly dinned into them that our Government is controlled by a small industrial clique, and this clique wants war for profit.

When President Eisenhower gives his message of peace and friendship, it will reach the hearts of tens of millions of Russians.

Peace with the United States is the message the Russian people want to hear, and President Eisenhower is the one living man who can give it convincingly.

DECLARATION OF CONFIDENCE AND SUPPORT BY WESTERN GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE, SEATTLE, WASH., MAY 18, 1960

Resolved, That the Governors of the Western Conference declare their strong and wholehearted support of the President of the United States in his dignified and unyielding response to the ignoble and outrageous demands of Chairman Khrushchev. We express our hope that the obstacles placed by Mr. Khrushchev in the path of discussion of grave international issues at the summit can be overcome by the leaders of the free world in furtherance of our deep desire to build a world where all peoples can live in freedom and justice, peace and dignity; unmolested and unafraid.

Gov. Grant Sawyer, of Nevada; Gov. William F. Quinn, of Hawaii; Gov. Albert D. Rosellini, of Washington; Gov. Mark O. Hatfield, of Oregon; Gov. Edmund G. Brown, of California; Gov. George Dewey Clyde, of Utah; Gov. John Burroughs, of New Mexico; Gov. J. J. Hickey, of Wyoming; Gov. William A. Egan, of Alaska; Gov. J. Hugo Aronson, of Montana; Gov. Robert E. Smylie, of Idaho; Gov. Stephen L. E. McNichols, of Colorado.

Mr. MANFIELD. Mr. President, I listened with interest to what the distinguished minority leader had to say about a speech by the two-time candidate of the Democratic Party, Mr. Adlai Stevenson, which speech was given in Cook County, I believe, last Thursday. Evidently the minority leader thinks that a man high in party councils should remain quiet when, in all good conscience, he perhaps feels a deepening disquiet.

It appears to me that so far as the Democratic leadership is concerned there will be an inquiry, which I understand, from reading the press reports today, has the tacit support of the minority leader.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. One of our distinguished correspondents grabbed me this morning as I was coming into the Capitol and began to ask about a possible investigation. I think I qualified my remark by saying, "If there is going to be an investigation," that probably the Foreign Relations Committee might undertake it.

I begin to have some doubts about the merit of an investigation, when we are dealing with such a sensitive matter as the whole intelligence system of this country. Once that door is opened, I doubt whether it will be closed again. Then who shall say what will be the repercussions?

So my statement was a qualified statement.

Mr. MANFIELD. I accept the Senator's statement, and of course I believe it. I was simply referring to a ticker tape report which indicated that if an inquiry were to be held the Foreign Relations Committee was the place to hold it.

9988

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 23

It happens that after every international conference of any significance the Secretary of State and other interested individuals almost always appear before the Committee on Foreign Relations and gives the committee a report. Although my knowledge comes from press reports, I understand from that source that there may be a suggestion tomorrow, when the Committee on Foreign Relations meets, that it conduct not an investigation but instead an inquiry, to furnish an opportunity for many interested Senators to raise questions which have been bothering them.

Speaking about questions, I dare say there is not a Member of this body on either side of the aisle who does not have at least one question which he would like to have answered.

If the inquiry is forthcoming, I wish to express the hope, as I have previously expressed it, that it will be an inquiry based upon the facts, that it will not become a political football and will not become such a campaign issue that the welfare and the unity of the country may well be lost in the shuffle.

I think Mr. Stevenson had the right to make the kind of speech he made. I do not think that speech is going to disrupt national unity. I would invite the attention of my colleagues to the fact that we still live in a free country and that we still have the right to express our opinions as we see fit. As a responsible official of the Democratic Party I can find no fault with Mr. Stevenson for making his honest views known in a speech in Cook County.

The minority leader has mentioned the fact that a story, so called, came out during the course of the summit conference, or prior thereto, in which Mr. Stevenson said something about the fact that he hoped the nuclear test ban negotiations would continue. Well, I hope they will continue, also, because I think what happens at Geneva in regard to the ban on nuclear testing is going to have a great effect not only upon this country, but also upon mankind as a whole.

The minority leader said that Mr. Stevenson advocated a reduction in U.S. forces in Berlin from 11,000 to 7,000. I do not desire to be picayunish, I assure the Senator, but it is my understanding that the forces of the three Western Allied Powers in Berlin are comprised roughly of 11,000 men, and the American forces comprise something on the order of 4,000 to 5,000 of the total.

The third thing with which the story seems to find fault, on the part of Mr. Stevenson, is the fact that he advocated consideration of the Rapacki plan, by means of which there might be created a neutralized zone in middle Europe. Others of us have advocated that, also. I have advocated consideration of the Rapacki plan, the Eden plan, and the Gaitskill plan, with the proviso that there be a quid pro quo in return before anything definite is done along these lines. I see nothing wrong with that.

I can understand the opposition of the Republican Party to what Mr. Stevenson has said, because, frankly speaking,

I think the Republicans look upon him as a possible presidential candidate. He may be. He may not be. This is one way of anticipating something in advance.

However, I find it extremely difficult to understand why Democrats should go out of their way to find fault with Mr. Stevenson for expressing his honest opinions. Some of them, in effect, want to "read him out" of the party. He will not be "read out" of the party, because he has made many contributions to our country in the past, and I anticipate he will make many more in the future.

Some people say, "Well, Mr. Stevenson is going to be our next Secretary of State." He may well be. I have heard the names of Mr. CHESTER BOWLES and of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] mentioned in that respect, also. That is a matter which will be determined by the next President, if he is a Democrat. If he is not a Democrat, we may rest assured that none of these three will be appointed. If the next President is a Republican, of course he will have to make his own decisions.

The reference to the 6 to 8 months, laid down by Mr. Khrushchev in the hope that a new administration will come into power, carried the implication by the distinguished minority leader that if the new President happened to be a Democrat, and most specifically if he happened to be Mr. Stevenson, things were going to be easier, that we were going to be "softer." Well, I do not think we are the ones who have been "soft" on communism, to revive an old Republican phrase. We did not invite Mr. Khrushchev to America. Mr. Khrushchev never invited a Democratic Presidential candidate to visit him in the Kremlin.

I do not know what Senators mean when they say that, because of the statement made by Mr. Khrushchev that 6 or 8 months would be time enough to hold another conference, if a Democrat is to go to such a conference it would indicate a sign of softness. It is hard for me to follow that reasoning.

I would advise my Republican colleagues, if I may, not to look too far ahead and not to arrive at too many assumptions too early.

I think we ought to find out something about the crowbar and something about the sledge hammer, and the place to find out about these articles and the place to raise these questions is in the Committee on Foreign Relations.

We have the Foreign Relations Committee to look into matters affecting the foreign policy of the United States; and what has been affected is the foreign policy of the United States. Mr. President, I have never heard of a statement attributed to another outstanding presidential candidate, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] to the effect that he advocated apologizing to Mr. Khrushchev. I do not know of any Democrat who has ever at any time advocated apologizing, publicly or otherwise, to Mr. Khrushchev. The Senator from Massachusetts will return to the Senate shortly, and I am sure he will take care of himself in that respect.

In respect to the interview, it is my understanding that Mr. Stevenson stated, as soon as the news of this interview broke, that he had had nothing to do with it, and that he did not give an interview of that nature, but I cannot vouch for that, because I am calling on memory, and going back to the public print.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish that the Republicans would let us take care of our business and that they would take care of their own business, but let us together take care of the Nation's business.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President—

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President—

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I try always to be careful about documentation. Everything I have said this morning has a documentary article to support the statement. The interview in Paris was pretty lengthy. It was a translation of an article by special correspondent Robert Boulay. The heading is "I Passed the Afternoon With the Possible Successor to Mr. Eisenhower—Adlai Stevenson Told Me, 'The Americans Must Quit Berlin and Europe if They Wish To Achieve Atomic Peace.'" That is the headline. It has a Chicago dateline, and after the introductory portion the interview was on a question and answer basis. It is all here. It was done at Adlai Stevenson's home at Libertyville, Ill. It must have appeared in the Paris newspapers because there is no more reputable foreign correspondent than Bill Stoneman on the Chicago Daily News foreign staff. He commented on it. David Lawrence also commented on it. I shall leave the entire question and answer statement to speak for itself as to precisely what Governor Stevenson said.

Then, of course, there is the factor of timing. The article hit the papers on the day Khrushchev got to Paris, and he had to read it, because he gave himself away in East Berlin when he mentioned that Adenauer had been our Secretary of State for 7 years, and that is precisely what Adlai Stevenson said to Robert Boulay at Libertyville, Ill. It would be amazing indeed to have words flowing out of two different mouths 3,500 miles apart, each individual being insensible of what the other said.

I have only one further comment to make, because I do not want to preempt the floor. My distinguished friend from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] said we had invited Mr. Khrushchev here. That is correct. We had invited Mr. Koslov. We had invited Mr. Mikoyan. We got them on the "home diamond." But I can remember another period in the history of this country when the President of the United States went to Yalta and when he went to Teheran, to their orbit, rather than have them here, and so it was much better to have them on the "home diamond." But all the articles are there and all the quotes are there; they must speak for themselves, including the estimate of the whole matter

by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] with respect to the character and the patriotism of Governor Stevenson and Senator KENNEDY are most unfortunate. I am consoled by the source from which they came.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I rise to a point of personal privilege.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana has the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, it seems to me that if we shoot off any more fireworks around here, we will not have any left for the Fourth of July. Our job now is to make certain that we will have the Fourth of July from now on, and that we have the right to celebrate it. It may be all right to shoot off fireworks, but I think we are shooting them off too close to the gas works to be helpful.

Like others, I have no doubt that Mr. Stevenson might have spoken rather indiscreetly in his speeches. He appears to be one of the ever-hopeful variety, so perhaps we should accept his remarks in that sort of hopeful atmosphere.

I, myself, do not regard Mr. Stevenson as being representative of more than one section of the Democratic Party. I think Mr. Farley represents another viewpoint within that party. Perhaps the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] may represent an element greater than the others put together. At least, that is what has been said. Whatever position they have to take, they probably have the right to take it.

However, in view of all the verbal fireworks which have taken place, both on the Senate floor and around the Nation, during the last few days, it appears to me that we have gone too far not to have a discreet, judicious, and careful inquiry into the events of the last 2 or 3 weeks, in the hope that we may fill in two or three gaps in our information. I do not see how this type of inquiry can hurt anyone. I should think it might prove helpful in the long run. I wish I might be present, if that inquiry is made by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, which is the place where it should be made, to see that there is no unfairness during the proceedings.

If we undertake to suppress an inquiry now, it will look to the world as if we really had something to cover up. I do not think anyone wants to do that. I do not think we have anything to cover up.

I think Mr. Khrushchev got himself on one wonderfully hot spot, and he had to have time—6 or 8 months, or, heaven knows, probably more than that—before he could get off the hot spot, and get out from under the various pressures which have been bearing down on him, and which made him scuttle the conference. I do not say he did not want to scuttle it anyway, but certainly he came to the conference intending to scuttle it, one way or another.

It has been said by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], though I do not think it was said exactly in that way, that an ICBM certainly cannot tell the

difference between a Democrat and a Republican. Even the ICBM has not gotten to the point where it can do that yet, simply by having a person walk past a machine. Certainly an ICBM—an intercontinental ballistic missile—could not tell any difference between us, should the point be reached where any enemy might see fit to use it against us.

We have a common job now. It is to assure the security of the United States, and to make every endeavor we can to lessen international tensions, and to lessen the risk of international conflict, which would be so terrible to contemplate that we should not be thinking of getting even with each others. We ought to be getting together, to make certain that the United States will not face any cataclysm in the future. I do not think we will have to face one, but I think it is important that we work together; that we find some other issues for November; and not concentrate on something which may prove injurious to all of us on the international scene.

I simply want to make certain that we have the right to shoot off fireworks on Fourth of July, and that we will celebrate the Fourth of July for a long, long time to come.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in response to what the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has just now stated, I wish to say that, as always, in a few words he reaches the heart of the matter. I think his statement is one to which all of us—Democrats and Republicans alike—can subscribe.

I wish to assure the Senator from Vermont and the Senate that, so far as I am concerned, there are no political implications and there is nothing picayunish in my attitude. But there is a desire to find the answers to some questions. In seeking those answers, I hope we try to avoid personalities and not raise charges or strawmen against persons such as the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], who is not now in the Chamber, to defend himself, or against Adlai Stevenson, who—like every other American—has a right to state his views. After we find the answers, if there then are criticisms, they can be answered.

I only hope that the next time something of this sort occurs, we shall have a little prior notice.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President—

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I had no prior notice of the Stevenson speech.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It was made last Thursday.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And generally I have no prior notice of the statements which from day to day are made on the floor of the Senate. Therefore, I usually find myself in the same dilemma in which the acting majority leader now finds himself.

The other point is that today, with the acceleration of events, it becomes difficult to document one's speech. I try to document the statements I make; I endeavor to state for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the sources and every document and every

report. That was the reason for what I said.

I make this final comment: I am unhappy when this matter gets into the political field or in the newspaper headlines. The headlines in the newspapers, particularly those in the Midwest, were printed in very large letters, "Adlai Charges Use of Crowbar"—or something to that effect. Obviously, we cannot "blink" it, because public opinion begins to be manufactured in exactly that way, and that is not conducive to unity.

Last week, when the majority leader made such an excellent statement, here on the floor, he mentioned the fact that the distinguished junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee; Governor Stevenson, the titular head of the Democrat Party, and twice its candidate for the Presidency; the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and the majority leader had signed a cablegram which was sent to the President, in Paris; and I said it was a refreshing note, and I was delighted to see it.

But one has to take judicial notice when a former candidate for the Presidency—who, first of all, is watched with interest and, second, travels about South America, Europe, Asia, and elsewhere, and confers with the foreign leaders—makes such a statement. How can one "blink" it? One has to take account of it. I was only taking judicial notice of what I have seen; and what I was able to put in the Record today was by way of documentation. Obviously, I am always contented to let that speak for itself.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I was not being serious when I said I hoped we would receive a little prior notice the next time an incident of this sort occurs, because I recall that I have asked very serious and delicate questions of the minority leader, without giving him prior notice. I appreciate what the Senator from Illinois has said.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President—

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I shall not long detain the Senate.

I regret that I was not in the Chamber at the beginning of this debate. I had no idea that attacks of this kind would be made at this hour on Monday.

Last week, in response to an inquiry in regard to the Foreign Relations Committee, I stated that it is customary for the committee to hold briefings and hearings on matters of importance. I think that, without exception, following every international conference which has been held since I have been here, always upon their return the Secretary of State and others have come before our committee, to inform it and, through it, the Senate and the Nation. I see nothing irregular about that. I think it entirely in order.

I am a little surprised that Members of this body on the other side of the aisle would be so aggressive about this particular matter. It seems to me something must be hurting their conscience, and they seem to be counterattacking

before any attack is made. No one has attacked anyone, so far as I know—that is to say, no one in this body. People outside, who have their impressions, can say what they like, for ours is a free country.

I do not know enough about all the background and the reasons and the explanations of the various statements made preliminary to the final break-up of the conference, to be able to reach any final conclusion. That is why I think a study and an inquiry by the Foreign Relations Committee is in order.

I propose, tomorrow morning, at the regular meeting of our committee, to submit this question; and I hope that after thorough discussion, the procedure the committee will follow will be agreed upon. I expect the procedure of the inquiry to be agreed upon by the members of the committee of both parties, because it is entirely in order, and follows the usual precedent, which I believe always has been followed in the past, when anything of importance in the international field has occurred.

I do not think it promotes the effort to keep this matter on a nonpartisan plane, to indulge in such acrimonious attacks here on the floor of the Senate on leading Members of either party—and, in this case, on Members of my party. I think it is most unfortunate; and certainly it is premature, because I do not believe any one of us is now able to arrive at firm and final conclusions in regard to the very tragic event which occurred last week, in Paris.

The only advice I gave to some of my friends of the Republican Party was that I hoped they would not try to pretend that what happened at Paris was a great triumph. I said that if that were done, necessarily it would call for rebuttal. I said I hoped we would soberly approach this matter, in a serious endeavor to determine, first, what happened; and, second, the practices and procedures which have grown up in our Government. I do not mean only the practices and procedures in the executive branch; I think the Congress itself has much to learn in this field, and I believe there are ways and means by which our procedures can be improved. Last year, the Foreign Relations Committee suggested ways which I think would have been a great improvement; and from time to time other Senators make similar suggestions. Certainly I do not believe that either the Congress or the Executive has perfected its methods of dealing with these very complex matters.

So I believe that the purpose of the proposed inquiry is, in the first place, to understand just what has happened; and, in the second place, if the circumstances call for it, to make some changes, in order to tighten up the administration.

But I believe the worst thing, from the national point of view and from the point of view of the welfare of the Nation, would be to pretend that we have experienced a great triumph, and that nothing need be said about what happened. Everyone knows what happened is a great tragedy for the entire world. Who is to blame, and so forth, is a subject of legitimate inquiry.

But at the moment I do not wish to indulge in a debate attacking members of my party or members of the other party. At this point, I believe that would be quite premature.

However, if, following inquiry, there are found to be reasons for criticizing the conduct of our policies, then, of course, it will be our duty to do so; and I do not believe that any plea for unity should foreclose any justified criticism based upon an inquiry which is held in a sober and responsible manner.

I am confident that the members of the administration, including the Secretary of State, have no objection at all to coming before the Foreign Relations Committee and giving their explanation of what happened. That is appropriate. That is what Secretary Dulles did. That is what Secretary Acheson always did after international meetings. He came before our committee and explained what happened, his reasons why, and his point of view. Then it was up to us to draw our own conclusions therefrom. That is the way I expect to proceed now. I think it will be beneficial at the proper time to make a report or observations or, if conditions warrant it, a criticism of the way things have been handled.

In the meantime, I think we ought to be careful in what we say, and ought not to inflame anyone's thoughts, and make sure we do not lose a sense of objectivity in forming our judgment on what the facts are after we develop them in a proper inquiry.

I do not propose at this time to pursue this debate on the substance of the speeches or what happened in Paris.

Mr. SCOTT and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio addressed the Chair.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield first to the Senator from Ohio. Then I shall yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, may I say at the outset, I completely agree with the statement made today by the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the acting majority leader, and I admire very much the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. I agree with him. Certainly, the distinguished Senator from Vermont made a very moderate and very wise statement with which all of us can agree.

Mr. President, unfortunately for President Eisenhower, and also unfortunately for the American people, the law of averages caught up with our President. His good luck over the years seemed to have deserted him, and at a time when he needed it most.

Without a doubt, President Eisenhower hoped to end his administration in an aura of peace and good will. He had been the supreme commander of the greatest army ever gathered under the bending sky of God. He had hoped that the high point and final public service in his life would be that, as Chief Executive of the United States, he would be regarded by future historians as a peacemaker. He even envisioned himself as the father of permanent peace. Instead

of that, he returned from Paris to Washington at a time when the increased tension in the cold war between this Nation and the Soviet Union has become more violent. In fact, he returns at a time when that relationship between our two nations could not become much worse, except by the temporary ending of diplomatic relations on the part of one or both nations.

He himself did not cause this situation. Inept officials in his administration created an appearance of saber rattling and jingoism that President Eisenhower had wished to avoid.

President Eisenhower, from the time of his 1952 campaign for election—that "clean as a hound's tooth" campaign—has placed an accent on teamwork on the part of all his associates. Morality has been glorified, as is entirely proper, yet, in an emergency that occurred due to the downing of an American reconnaissance plane far within the territory of the Soviet Union, American people—and in fact, peoples the world over—were given conflicting and utterly false statements by administration officials in authority in the United States.

Leaders of friendly nations were startled over the muddleheaded, mentally inert, and inept handling of the controversy by administration officials over the downing of this plane.

American prestige throughout the world dropped, and no one is to blame more than officials of the Eisenhower administration.

Doubtless, President Eisenhower himself must share in the responsibility. It appears he failed to know personally details of the work of our Central Intelligence Agency. It may be that had he been an alert, active, strong President, he would have been in constant touch with the actions and activities of all administrative agencies and in position to hold in check any which directly or indirectly acted in violation of the law and customs of nations.

Apparently the President had no knowledge that our U-2 plane penetrated behind the Iron Curtain in an aerial reconnaissance and was approximately 1,300 miles within the borders of the Soviet Union a few days before the last Big Four summit conference meeting to be held during his administration.

What should have been feared, occurred. This resulted in a propaganda victory for Premier Khrushchev, who instantly, violently, and unmercifully pushed his advantage to the uttermost. Leaders of friendly nations were shocked and our Chief Executive was humiliated by the tongue lashing from Premier Khrushchev brought on by the failure of his trusted subordinates.

It is true President Eisenhower endured with dignity and restraint a vituperative face-to-face tongue lashing from the Communist Dictator Khrushchev. Personally, I would prefer a President who would have lashed back instantly and forcefully with some blunt, uncensored Texas, Missouri, or Massachusetts language and plain spoken epithets.

Mr. President, I assert that what seems to be the Eisenhower concept of the Presidency of the United States,

1960

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

9993

frequently by remote control from Augusta and Gettysburg, and frequently altogether at the discretion of subordinates, is not sufficient for 1960 and this grim period of international anarchy.

Operating the Presidency on a part-time basis and not in the personalized manner of Abraham Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Harry Truman, removed President Eisenhower from key decisions and left our allies and our own citizens, even President Eisenhower himself, in a state of uncertainty about what was going on.

In addition, Secretary of Defense Gates calling the alert of the Armed Forces for Sunday, May 15, was an extraordinarily reckless act. Bear in mind, Sunday, May 15, was a bitter day for us. A mischance had occurred. Blunder was compounded upon blunder. The tension of the cold war between the Soviet Union and this Nation was increased.

The slogan of peace and prosperity was not being uttered in even the softest whisper. This was the hour and day picked by Secretary of Defense Gates for an exercise to parade the armed might of this Nation before the world. This, added to false statements and deceit and the confusion of a right-about-face statement, plus a bristling declaration that invading the air over the Soviet Union was necessary, plus an inference that this practice would be continued—all of this was just a little too much.

Then, a little too late, came the statement backing down on the previous statement that aerial spying would be continued. This despite the fact that the Vice President had publicly reaffirmed the policy of continuing aerial reconnaissance.

Mr. President, we can truly say that these have not been our proudest hours. I thank the Senator from Montana for yielding to me.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, would the Senator from Montana at this time consider yielding the floor?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Does the Senator have in mind raising a question of personal privilege?

Mr. SCOTT. No, I do not.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Because, if the Senator did, I wanted to read rule XIX.

Mr. SCOTT. If the Senator does that, he may force me into raising a point of personal privilege. I hope not to be pressed into doing so.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I had understood the Senator was going to rise to a point of personal privilege, but I understand now he is not, and therefore I am delighted to yield to him.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the Senator from Montana.

Mr. President, am I recognized in my own right?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the Chair. I had originally planned to raise the point of personal privilege, because I wished to make it crystal clear that I did not at any time, nor have I ever at any time,

impugned the patriotism of any other Member or of any candidate for the Presidency, and I do not now impugn the patriotism of any Senator, or of Governor Stevenson, whose recent unfortunate remarks have infuriated a good part of our Nation.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SCOTT. If I may do so briefly, I am glad to yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. My remarks will be very brief. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The statement issued by Gov. Adlai Stevenson was issued to the press May 18, and I shall quote it.

My recollection is that the young man was brought to my home by friends. I never give exclusive interviews without request. And he would not have received one had he asked in such circumstances.

As I recall, he wanted to discuss all of the problems of Europe; and evidently confused discussion with opinion.

What he reports me as saying have, of course, never been my views and are not my views today.

The most charitable explanation of such irresponsibility, presumption and discourtesy is that his English was poor and my French no better.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, if the Senator from Missouri had been on the floor—or, if he was on the floor and had been paying attention—he would have heard me read several times part of that statement myself. I added that Mr. Boulay, among those who know him, is known to speak English very well, and therefore is presumed to be able to understand English when it is addressed to him.

I further suggested that the way to clarify this matter is to have the testimony of Mr. Boulay and to have the testimony of Governor Stevenson to see what was really said.

However, I rose for the purpose of saying that I do not impugn the patriotism of anyone. I regret that the Senator from Missouri, who is my very good friend, used the phrase with reference to myself of "considering the source." I am not a candidate for the Presidency. I hope that "considering the source" has no reference to Presidential candidacy.

I will leave the remark where it has been made, since I rose in good faith and I am proceeding in good faith to make a certain point, which is that when I spoke on the floor about a week ago I praised the distinguished majority leader [Mr. JOHNSON of Texas] and the distinguished majority whip, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] for their patriotism and for their true show of a bipartisan approach to these critical circumstances.

However, after that speech a certain speech was made by the former Governor of Illinois, and a certain speech was made by the distinguished, patriotic, and able Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. Those speeches did appear in the press. An issue was raised by those speeches which had not been raised on the floor, and which all of us had expressed the hope would not be raised. That issue was whether Presi-

dent Eisenhower should apologize to Khrushchev or whether President Eisenhower should seek to reopen the negotiations with Khrushchev by retreating from a previous position.

A further issue raised again, I will say, by my friend the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] a moment ago, was the issue of the action of the Secretary of Defense in calling an air alert.

Therefore, these matters become legitimate subjects of discussion on the floor of the Senate.

My answer as to whether the President should have apologized is that, in my opinion, he should not have. My answer as to whether the President should have appeased Mr. Khrushchev, or reopened the negotiations at the expense of an expression of apology or regret on our part, is that he should not have.

My answer as to the calling of an air alert ought to be familiar to all of the American people.

The tragedy at Pearl Harbor occurred immediately after the break up of a conference with the Japanese leaders. Lest another tragedy occur in America, the Secretary of Defense, undoubtedly with the approval of the President, certainly as a matter of policy, upon the breakup of this conference, or observing that it was about to terminate, in any event, put this country on an air alert.

Some have suggested that President Eisenhower should have met Khrushchev with his own kind of attack, that he should have lashed back, that he should have assaulted Khrushchev with similar tactics.

Mr. President, Theodore Roosevelt a long time ago advised us to speak softly and to carry a big stick. I do not believe that President Eisenhower should have demeaned himself by adopting the method, the manner, the tactics or the language of Khrushchev. I believe he was correct in speaking with dignity at that time, and I believe he was right in showing that America had a big stick, by reason of the calling of the air alert.

I hope, if there is to be an investigation—if the Committee on Foreign Relations believes such an investigation should be had—that an investigation will be made of American foreign policy as a whole, if the committee wishes to do so, and that such an investigation will also look into the charges which I regard as being unfounded, as being politically inspired, as being motivated by desires to be either President or Secretary of State.

All of these charges—some of which would appear to be reckless, unfounded, and certainly unduly deferential to the leader of the Soviet Government at this time—ought also to be included in such an investigation.

Finally, Mr. President, the Russians have asked for a hearing at the United Nations, charging the United States as an aggressor. Surely, the Russian Government should not be given ammunition by any responsible American and should not have the benefit of being able to argue that responsible Americans agree with Khrushchev that he ought to have an

9994

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 23

apology. The Russians should not have the benefit of this attitude of some people that the Russians were right and we were wrong.

It would be well, if this is to become an issue in a political campaign, that we have a moratorium on it until after the issue raised by the Russians has been fully heard in the United Nations, so that we do not furnish them with ammunition.

Mr. President, I am very glad that President Eisenhower, no matter what any other person may think, did not crawl on his belly to a bully.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I am glad to yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator recommends that there should be a moratorium on this discussion. What puzzles me, and what I still do not understand, is why the Senator and his colleagues chose this particular time to precipitate this violent attack upon certain leaders of the Democrats. We did not open up this matter. What is the logic of the Republicans choosing Monday morning, immediately before the United Nations meeting is to consider these charges, to open up this violent partisan attack?

Mr. SCOTT. I am glad to point out to the Senator from Arkansas that these remarks should not be considered violent attacks. They should be considered as rebuttal and reply to the very unfortunate statements attributed to at least two responsible leaders of the Democratic Party, including the titular head of the Democratic Party.

I seek to express, as I think surely we should express, our regret that these particular statements have been made, if in fact they were made during the past week.

I appreciate the blandness of the comment of the Senator from Arkansas, but it does not conceal who made the statements.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The statement attributed to Mr. Stevenson he has very clearly denied he made. I think a great deal was made of that.

Mr. SCOTT. If the Senator will permit, Mr. Stevenson has not withdrawn the statements which he made on other occasions last week within the United States in public bodies, which were publicly reported. He has merely refused to accept the quotations attributed to him in the article appearing in a French newspaper.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not wish to argue the merit of that point. It seems to me rather ill advised to begin an open and very strong attack upon the Democrats before any Member of this body, at least of whom I am aware, has tried to be critical at all.

I have not been critical. I consciously refrained from making critical comments on this subject, both when I arrived at the airport and later this morning in order that there might be a proper inquiry. I did not wish to inspire the very kind of political attack which has taken place today. I was taken aback by it. I do not think it makes it easier for us to conduct a reasonable, objective, and quiet inquiry into what has taken place.

Mr. SCOTT. I say to the Senator from Arkansas, for whom I have the highest respect, that the Senator is evidently not aware of the statement issued by the Democratic Advisory Council and approved by the membership, including a number of Senators, or the action taken by at least 12 Members of the other body, all of which contributed to initiating an unfortunate controversy.

Does the Senator from Missouri wish me to yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I understood the Senator was yielding the floor.

Mr. ANDERSON rose.

Mr. SCOTT. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and then I shall yield the floor.

Mr. ANDERSON. May I express to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] the hope that he will take a good look at his language, because I know he did not mean it when he said:

It is my hope that neither the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY, nor that other candidate for the Presidency, Governor Stevenson will—either of them—brand themselves as turncoats.

Mr. SCOTT. "Turncoats," is the phrase. I shall be glad to examine the language.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wish the Senator would, because it comes close to violating the rule. The transcript reads:

So it is my hope that they will relieve themselves of the curse of suspicion of appeasement.

I wondered if the Senator intended that language.

Mr. SCOTT. I appreciate the suggestion of the Senator from New Mexico, and if my language appears at any point to be intemperate, I shall be glad to revise it in accordance with my own better judgment, if it seems necessary.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. If the Senator will withdraw his remarks with respect to Adlai Stevenson and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], I will be glad to withdraw mine.

Mr. SCOTT. I must decline the offer of my friend from Missouri. The remarks of Adlai Stevenson and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] appeared in the public press and unfortunately cannot now be withdrawn.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I then ask unanimous consent that the reporter read into the Record the statement made by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield the floor?

Mr. SCOTT. I wish to address the same question to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] which was addressed to me by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and that is: Is the Senator rising on a question of personal privilege?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I am not rising on a question of personal privilege.

Mr. SCOTT. Then I will yield the floor.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the stenographic record be read at this point to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the reporter will bring in the transcript.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What particular part of the transcript is to be read?

Mr. SYMINGTON. The part which the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and I requested to be brought to the floor of the Senate with respect to the remarks about the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and former Gov. Adlai Stevenson.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the clerk reading the transcript as described? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will read it.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

I might also add, in connection with the statement of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY, as reported in the Portland Oregonian, that the Senator himself said:

"Khrushchev laid down two conditions to President Eisenhower for going on with the summit meeting. One was to apologize. I think that might have been possible to do."

Then the quotation goes on to other matters.

The report in the Oregonian is that:

"Later KENNEDY modified the word 'apologize,' and said the President might 'express regret.'"

It is my hope that neither the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts nor that other candidate for the Presidency, Governor Stevenson, will—either one of them—brand himself as a turncoat. So it is my hope that they will relieve themselves of the curse of suspicion of appeasement, and it is my hope that the unity, which started out so well in support of the President and in support of the administration, may somehow be found again.

But as Mr. Farley has so well said, he has no part in the appeasement process as exemplified by the unfortunate statement of Governor Stevenson.

He said it did not represent his views and that "the most charitable explanation of such irresponsibility, presumption, and discourtesy is that his English was poor and my French no better."

Mr. SCOTT. I believe the clerk is still reading from my statement, but I call attention to the fact that the word is "turn-quote."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri has the floor.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the Record has been read to my satisfaction at this point, and unless the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] would like to have the reading continued, I wish no further part of the Record read.

Mr. SCOTT. I request that no further portion of the Record be read.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to a point of parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. I have not heard the debate except in the last few minutes. I shall make some comment on my own

1960

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

9995

time shortly. My parliamentary inquiry is this: Is it proposed that the Record be changed in any way from what was stated on the floor of the Senate today?

Mr. SYMINGTON. No. In answer to the inquiry of my friend from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], I state that the reverse is now true.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wished to suggest to the Senator from Pennsylvania that the term "turncoat" is an unfortunate term, and also the expression "suspicion of appeasement" is an unfortunate term, and I expressed the hope that those terms might be modified.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. May terms spoken on the floor of the Senate, no matter how unfortunate they may be, but nevertheless spoken in debate, be changed by the spokesman or withdrawn by the spokesman in the absence of unanimous consent?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARLSON in the chair). I am advised by the Parliamentarian that a Senator may correct an error which may have been made, but he may not substantially change the context.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Chair advise the Senator from Oregon the definition of the word "error" under the ruling?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that such an error would be a misstatement, possibly a misquotation, as to the form of the statement, but not as to content.

Mr. MORSE. Not as to content.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, does the Senator wish me to yield further?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to have the parliamentary situation cleared up. So that the Record may be perfectly clear, speaking hypothetically, if a Senator makes a statement which is critical of some Government policy or some Government official and then has a second thought minutes later which causes him to wish he had not said what he had said and asks to have the matter stricken from the Record, does such request require unanimous consent?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair holds that such a request would require unanimous consent.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Chair for the ruling, and I wish to serve notice now that I shall object to any change in today's Record.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President—

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. I would like to make clear, so there will be no misunderstanding concerning the remarks of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who was not present when the statement was made, that I have no intention of changing the sense or meaning of anything I have said. If I have made grammatical errors or errors of syntax, I reserve the same right which is available to other Senators to make such corrections; and I will, of course, be my own judge. I

say to the Senator from Oregon, as to what changes or revisions I make, exercising the same privilege as is available to the Senator from Oregon. But I wish now to make it perfectly clear that I reject any inference that I desire to withdraw the meaning of anything that I have said.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I assure the Senator from Pennsylvania that I made no implication that the Senator had any intention to change any of his remarks. There was a request or suggestion made that an opportunity be offered to change remarks. To that, I object. I merely wish to say that the Senator from Pennsylvania, under the rule, is free to comply with the rule, but when he says he will be his own judge as to what he will change, I say the Senate will be the final judge in case he makes a change outside the rule.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, for the past hour and a half we have heard a series of nonpolitical, nonpartisan statements from both sides of the aisle. All of these remarks contained suggestions about what should or should not have been done at the summit, as well as attempted to assess the blame for what was or was not done.

In making these remarks, many Members of the Senate, as well as most of the presidential candidates, have been quoted. However, in listening to these remarks, I note that one very important presidential candidate has been ignored. To my knowledge, he has not been quoted in the Senate today. Yet it is my opinion that this presidential candidate, in his speech on the floor of the Senate last week, made one of the most statesmanlike speeches which have been made in connection with the summit conference, and again, in Indianapolis, Ind., last week made another very appropriate comment, one which I believe every Member of the Senate would do well to ponder before we get too partisan.

I refer to a statement made by our majority leader, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], in which, when he was asked to assess blame for the Paris fiasco, he observed:

Any jackass can kick down a barn, but it takes a good carpenter to build one.

[Laughter.]

ONE LESSON FROM THE SUMMIT

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, an unseen but potent consideration at the summit tragedy was the administration's fiscal policy of placing expenditure ceilings above military strength.

If this administration had approached the summit conference from a position of relative strength over the Communists, the rude but shrewd Kremlin chief would have been less belligerent.

The Soviet leader, on the other hand, approached the summit with certain knowledge about:

Our small and relatively immobile ground forces with their antiquated equipment,

Their rocket and missile superiority.

Our failure to provide an airborne alert capability and the consequent vulnerability of our retaliatory strength.

Their great numerical superiority in submarines, with and without missiles.

Moreover, the Soviet leader knew that the United States would have been stronger in all of these respects if our military experts, rather than our budget bookkeepers, had been listened to.

Instead major attention has been given in this country toward feeding the American people a diet of complacency, backed up by appealing slogans.

We cannot afford to waste any time in abandoning these policies of weakness. In fact, if we do not act promptly, it may soon be too late, because, at our present pace, and under existing policies, we may find ourselves shortly in a very critical position.

Therefore, I recommend the following program now:

That the Secretary of Defense be authorized and directed, at once, to raise overall expenditure ceilings in his Department so as to carry out this program.

That the Secretary of Defense direct the removal of all overtime limitations on high priority projects and order a sharp acceleration in those projects.

That the Air Force be authorized and directed to take the procurement and crew-training actions for the SAC air alert capability which General Power recommended, and that the Congress appropriate \$415 million above the budget request for that purpose.

That the Congress appropriate \$360 million above the budget request for going ahead as fast as possible with the B-70 weapons system project.

That the Congress appropriate \$1.3 billion over and above the budget request for acceleration of the Atlas-Titan, Minuteman, Polaris, Hound Dog, and Sky-Bolt programs.

That the Congress authorize an increase of Army personnel strength from 870,000 to 925,000, and appropriate \$120 million for that purpose. In addition, that \$800 million be appropriated over and above the budget request for procurement of new equipment for the Army.

That the Congress authorize an increase of Marine personnel strength from 175,000 to 200,000 and appropriate an additional \$40 million for that purpose.

That the Congress appropriate \$465 million over and above the budget request for antisubmarine warfare.

The above recommendations for air alert, B-70, missiles, Army personnel, Army procurement, Marine personnel, and antisubmarine warfare would amount to \$3½ billion over and above the budget request for those programs.

This total of \$3½ billion is the equivalent of less than 3 days of our gross national product, and would seem to be a small contribution to greater national security in view of the threat facing the free world.

It is hoped that the recent failure of high level negotiations will awaken us to action and, to that extent, make a

9996

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 23

similar but more permanent contribution to reality than did Sputnik I when it broke the space barrier.

W. C. HANDY, "FATHER OF THE BLUES"

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President (on May 2 I made remarks and received unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a biographical sketch entitled "The Legend of W. C. Handy, Father of the Blues."

I ask unanimous consent that my introductory remarks may be expanded to include, immediately after the sentence "The general chairman was Mr. Frank R. Ahlgren, of the Memphis Commercial Appeal," the material which I send to the desk.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At this point I should like to say that due recognition should be given to all of those who participated in making this a memorable event. Because of their untiring efforts on Sunday, May 1, 1960, the city of Memphis added another page to the history book of the Nation.

It was not an easy job to make this dream of Frank Ahlgren's come true. However, when he told his dream to a group of outstanding civic-minded men from all walks of life, they all put their shoulders to the wheel and gratuitously agreed to shoulder their respective burdens to make this dream become a reality.

It took almost 2 years of tireless, unselfish work. Many details had to be ironed out. First of all a considerable amount of money had to be raised.

He began his activities in 1958. Realizing that the late W. C. Handy was a distinguished composer-member of the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers (ASCAP), Mr. Ahlgren contacted Paul Cunningham, at that time the president of the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers. Mr. Ahlgren interested Mr. Cunningham and ASCAP to the extent that this great society, which not only protects the interests of its members but never forgets them or their loved ones after the member passes on, immediately agreed to allocate a \$5,000 gift toward the erection of the statue that now stands in Handy Park in the city of Memphis. From this sizable contribution thousands of others gave what they could.

When sufficient funds were raised, Mr. Ahlgren commissioned the famous Italian sculptor, Prof. Leone Tomassi, of the Marinelli Foundation at Florence, Italy, to mold into golden bronze the 8-foot statue of the never-to-be-forgotten W. C. Handy.

After this was arranged other important details had to be worked out. Again Frank Ahlgren, ably assisted by that great civil leader, Lt. George Lee, and that indefatigable worker, George Sisler, of the Memphis Commercial Appeal, immediately arranged through ASCAP in New York to bring down to Memphis a galaxy of stars. Among them were Juanita Hall (of Rodgers and Hammerstein's "Flower Drum Song"); Mahalia Jackson, great delineator of spirituals; Lonnie Sattin, recording star of Warner Bros. records; Eubie Blake and Noble Sissie, famous ASCAP composers and a newcomer from the recording field, Miss Damita Jo.

With this array of talent ASCAP, through Mr. Cunningham, reached out and arranged with Mr. Hank Slavick of television station WMCT to televise an hour-long program before and during the unveiling of the statue.

In years to come whenever I hear a W. C. Handy song, I shall always remember the city of Memphis on that day of days when a group of civic-minded men arranged a lasting tribute, attended by thousands, to the "father of the blues."

Furthermore, I shall always remember the fitting climax that came long after the evening sun went down when from New York City Mr. Ed Sullivan, on his nationally televised show, dramatically told the Nation how the city of Memphis made history on Sunday, May 1, 1960.

ILLEGAL ACTIVITIES ON THE PART OF LABOR RACKETEERS AND MANAGEMENT

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, during the course of the hearings of the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field, we have on numerous occasions communicated with local law enforcement authorities when our investigations have disclosed illegal activities on the part of labor racketeers or management.

I should like to place in the RECORD an editorial of the Long Island Daily Press, dated May 17, 1960, entitled "Victory and Warning," an editorial of Newsday of the same date, entitled "A Big Victory," as well as a letter dated May 18, 1960, from the district attorney of Nassau County, N.Y., Mr. Manuel W. Levine, enclosing these editorial comments on the successful prosecution of labor racketeers who operated juke box Local 266 of the Teamsters Union.

Both the officials of this union and the owners of a juke box company were convicted of conspiracy. The officials of this local were also convicted on charges of coercion and extortion. These convictions were hailed by the newspapers as a great victory on the side of law enforcement.

I may say that much of the information upon which these prosecutions were based was developed by the Senate select committee.

I wish to commend and congratulate Mr. Manuel W. Levine, the district attorney of Nassau County, N.Y., for the monumental accomplishment of securing convictions of these racketeers after a trial which lasted for 3½ months.

The district attorney in his letter pointed out that it was unfortunate that some of the defendants were freed from prosecution due to inability of the prosecutor to introduce into evidence certain wiretaps which would have proved them guilty of a crime.

I understand that had they been permitted to use wiretap evidence which was available to them, in all probability all these defendants would have been convicted. Those who escaped, escaped upon that one technicality.

These were taps made pursuant to New York State laws and pursuant to a New York State court order. Some States, such as New York State, have enacted laws to enable their enforcement agencies to intercept communications under proper safeguards and to eliminate the dangers of promiscuous and improper use. In New York, for example, the enforcement agencies must apply to the court of highest original jurisdiction

for a warrant to permit the interceptions. This warrant is only granted when the court is satisfied that reasonable grounds exist that evidence of crimes will be obtained as a result of the wiretap.

The inability to introduce these wiretaps stems from the decisions in the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit in the case of *People against O'Rourke*, which follows the decisions in the *United States v. Benanti* (355 U.S. 96).

In its decision, the Supreme Court ruled wiretap evidence obtained by State officers under authority of a State law was inadmissible in the Federal courts. The language of the decision left a cloud on the right of States to legally authorize law-enforcement agencies to obtain court warrants to intercept communications under proper safeguards.

The lower courts—*People against O'Rourke*—have followed the line laid down by the Supreme Court and have indicated that, while not enjoining the State courts, the introduction of wiretap evidence by State officials in State courts would be in violation of section 605, Federal Communications Act of 1934, and thus would constitute a crime.

The district attorney pointed out that the inability to use wiretaps in local law-enforcement cases is a severe blow to the side of law and order. He expressed the hope that Congress would be able to do something in this session so that one of our most effective tools against bigtime racketeers and hoods would not have been removed.

On January 16, 1958, shortly after the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in the *Benanti* case, I introduced a bill, S. 3013—85th Congress, 2d session—amending section 605 of the Communications Act, to clarify the right of State law enforcement agencies to use wiretaps to uncover evidence of the commission of serious crimes.

The Supreme Court in the *Benanti* case did not rule on constitutional questions. The decision was based solely on the interpretation of the intention of Congress when it passed section 605 of the Federal Communications Act of 1934, which declares:

No person not being authorized by the sender shall intercept any communication and divulge or publish the existence, contents, substance, purport, effect, or meaning of such intercepted communication to any person.

It is my belief that Congress, in the enactment of section 605, never intended to cripple and hamper law enforcement agencies in their efforts to stamp out crime and punish criminals.

When I introduced S. 3013, I predicted that the detection, investigation, and prosecution of crime, particularly organized crime, would be seriously handicapped and weakened by the Supreme Court decision that is proving to be true. In many cases, prosecution and investigation of crimes would be completely thwarted and would collapse were wiretapping to be denied to the law enforcement agencies.

Recent developments show that the court decisions have created an in-

1960

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

10031

grants to public facilities, \$10 million for subsistence payments for retraining, \$1.5 million for vocational training grants, and \$4.5 million for technical assistance.⁴³

The bill provides the following criteria in order to define eligibility for depressed-area aid:

First. Unemployment of 12 percent of the civilian labor force persisting for 12 months;

Second. Unemployment of 9 percent of this group for 15 out of 18 months;

3. Unemployment of 6 percent of this group for 18 out of 24 months.⁴⁴

The proponents of this measure define their objectives in the preamble of the bill, as follows:

The Congress declares that the maintenance of the National economy at a high level is vital to the best interests of the United States, but that some of our communities are suffering substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment; that such unemployment and underemployment cause hardship to many individuals and their families and detracts from the national welfare by wasting vital human resources; that to overcome this problem the Federal Government, in cooperation with the States, should help areas of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment to take effective steps in planning and financing their economic redevelopment; that Federal assistance to communities, industries, enterprises, and individuals in areas needing redevelopment should enable such areas to achieve lasting improvement and enhance the domestic prosperity by the establishment of stable and diversified local economies; and that under the provisions of this act new employment opportunities should be created by developing and expanding new and existing facilities and resources without substantially reducing employment in other areas of the United States.⁴⁵

The Department of Labor makes regular reports on 149 communities, in terms of the percentage of unemployment prevailing among the civilian labor force. Based on these studies, early in 1959, approximately 20 of these areas would meet one of the criteria set forth in S. 722 for depressed-area aid.⁴⁶ The administration, the Republican and Democratic congressional leadership, as well as the supporters of the more liberal bill referred to above, are in agreement that depressed areas constitute a serious problem, which justifies some Federal assistance. At the present time, most existing depressed areas fall into one of the following categories:

Coal-mining towns in Pennsylvania, West Virginia, eastern Kentucky, and sections of adjoining States; particularly hard hit are anthracite mining areas such as the Wyoming Valley of Pennsylvania—for example Scranton, Pa.

New England towns in which textile employment has materially declined; for example, Lawrence, Mass.

Areas where employment in railroad shops was reduced as a result of diesel-

ization of the railroad industry; for example, Altoona, Pa.

Resort and other areas which have never established a solid industrial base sufficient to support full-time employment of the community's labor force; for example, Asheville, N.C.

Towns in which the economy depended on a natural resource which has been largely exhausted—northern Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin towns formerly dependent on copper or iron mining or lumber; for example, Iron Mountain, Mich.⁴⁷

One-industry towns are characteristic of many shipbuilding industries. Before discarding existing programs which enable us to maintain necessary facilities, careful consideration must be given to the ultimate cost to all taxpayers of creating additional depressed areas. These costs include not only possible Federal grants, but, in addition, the loss of existing tax revenues. Most important is the loss of personal dignity for the individual directly concerned, and, for the community, the loss of the skills he possesses.

Inasmuch as shipbuilding subsidies are admittedly the only means of meeting the urgent problems of national defense under a series of probable conditions in a future emergency, it is foolhardy to attempt to save less than \$150 million in gross outlays and thereby destroy an essential industry. Furthermore, these savings are ephemeral. The ultimate cost includes a loss of revenues as well as expenditures to support new nonproductive Federal programs.

Ships or any other necessary element in our national defense are preferable to make-work projects which are implied in all of the depressed area legislation which has been before the Congress. Under existing world tensions, and with rapid technological progress on so many different fronts, we cannot afford to become dependent on other nations to provide advanced designs for our merchant marine and naval auxiliaries.

FOREIGN POLICY PROBLEMS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a few comments on some of the foreign policy problems which confront the Republic. I am not surprised at the Republican attack which has been made today on the floor of the Senate on Adlai Stevenson, because the Republicans very well know that if Adlai Stevenson should be nominated at the Democratic National Convention in Los Angeles, he would be overwhelmingly elected President of the United States in November 1960.

This is a typical Republican downgrading strategy which we on this side of the aisle must expect in the months ahead. In fact, we must expect it regardless of which Democrat is nominated.

Adlai Stevenson is one of the greatest minds in American public life, and the White House calls for a great mind.

⁴⁷ Ibid.

We have sorely needed one in the White House for almost 8 years.

As Democrats we have the responsibility in the campaign ahead to discuss openly and frankly with the American people the issues of American foreign policy.

I want the Record to show this afternoon that I stand behind every word Adlai Stevenson spoke in his Chicago speech which has been referred to. I am glad the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] has already put it in the Record. It was a typical, statesmanlike speech from Adlai Stevenson.

It is my opinion and judgment that if the American people had elected him as President of the United States in 1952, we would not be as close to war today as we are. I wish to say to my Democratic colleagues I think they ought to stop the practice of sneezing every time President Eisenhower coughs about a foreign policy matter. The Democrats have themselves to blame, in large measure, for the plight in which our party finds itself in regard to the matter of foreign policy, because we have had too many Democratic leaders who have been rubber-stamping a wrong foreign policy.

The Democratic Party owes it to the American people to take the foreign policy issue to the people and give them a choice on foreign policy.

It is my opinion that if we continue to follow the Republican foreign policy for many more years, we shall be in the midst of a nuclear war, out of which no one will be victorious, because, in my judgment, the evidence is abundantly clear that neither side can win a nuclear war.

Therefore, because this issue has been raised on the floor of the Senate today, I wish to make a few statements about it for the Record.

AMERICAN PEOPLE UNINFORMED ON FOREIGN POLICY

The United States and Russia are equally feared and jointly feared, and rightly so, in many parts of the globe, as the two great threats to the peace of the world. I know the American people want peace; we, the people, are dedicated to peace; but the sad fact is our Government is following a foreign policy that is bound inevitably to end in a nuclear war, unless the American people make it very clear to the leadership of the country that they want that policy changed. How can they make it clear? The American people are uninformed on American foreign policy due to the fact that the Eisenhower administration, during the last 8 years, has taken the people a long way down the road to Government by secrecy. Government by secrecy does not end up in freedom. Government by secrecy does not end up in the protection of the democratic processes. Government by secrecy frequently ends up in war. And we are on the way.

The time has come, in my judgment, when the Democratic Party should offer to lead the American people back to the Wilsonian doctrine of open covenants openly arrived at, and make clear to the American people, in the historic cam-

⁴³ Op. cit., Area Redevelopment Act, H. Rept. 360, p. 7.

⁴⁴ Op. cit., Area Redevelopment Act, H. Rept. 360, p. 31.

⁴⁵ Bill analysis, American Enterprise Association, Inc., 86th Cong., 1st sess., Rept. No. 7, Washington, D.C., Feb. 25, 1959, p. 8.

⁴⁶ Op. cit., bill analysis, p. 2.

10032

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 23

paign ahead, that we are through with secret diplomacy, that we are going to stop rubberstamping the secret diplomacy of the Eisenhower administration. Therefore, it is time we make clear to the American people that, as the Democratic Party, we are through with undercutting and undermining the United Nations, and that we propose to return to a sound democratic policy of seeking to follow the doctrine of international decisions based upon law, and take our case to an international organization, such as the United Nations, with such reforms in the United Nations as we are sorely needed.

We are, in my judgment, in an immoral nuclear armaments race, an armaments race that cannot be reconciled by a single moral principle to which we bow our heads on Sunday. Those principles of morality ought to be practiced the other 6 days of the week, as well as revered on Sunday.

We are in danger of writing a sordid chapter in world history by a continuation of an immoral nuclear armaments race along with a nation the leadership of which we know to be amoral. Is it not an historic commentary that the great, moral Nation of the United States is permitting itself to be drawn into an immoral nuclear armaments race, without paying attention to the other part of the paradox in which we live?

MILITARY SPOKESMEN ON FOREIGN POLICY

We live in a paradox, Mr. President. We live in a paradox in which we have to keep ourselves so militarily strong that Russia will understand she will have everything to lose and nothing to gain by an aggressive action against the free world. But, Mr. President, if that is the end of our goal, if that is the sum and substance of our procedures with regard to foreign policy, then the end result is bound to be war.

I listened to testimony of an expert, not very many weeks ago, who was talking about what would happen in a moderate nuclear war. He made very clear that there is not such a thing, of course, as the possibility of a moderate nuclear war, because the probabilities are that if a nuclear war should start it would be a total war, and all the bombs would be dropped in a relatively short period of time.

Speaking hypothetically about a moderate nuclear war, this expert said such a war would result, in the first 10 days, in the loss of 50 million lives in the United States and more lives in Russia and Europe. Let us try to reconcile that, Mr. President, with moral principles. We simply cannot forget that history goes on and on. Nations rise and fall.

Mr. President, it happens to be our patriotic duty, as I see our patriotic duty, to do what we can to give the greatest guarantee of an ever-rising America for centuries to come, rather than to follow a foreign policy which, in my judgment, increases the risks of war month by month.

We only have to sit and to listen to the top military brass testify, Mr. President, to know how dangerous is the period in which we live.

There is one thing the Democratic Party ought to make perfectly clear. It is that if the Democrats are elected to power in November 1960 the military will stop issuing foreign policy statements. The military, under a Democratic administration, will learn once more a lesson which it seems to have forgotten, that the job of the American military group is to administer a foreign policy determined by a civilian government and not in any way to interrupt it or usurp it.

Periodically, Mr. President, we listen to statements by Admiral Burke as to what is going to happen in the Formosa Straits or in the Caribbean, and we listen to statements by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in regard to foreign policy. If we had a President who thoroughly understood the meaning of a civilian government, Mr. President, that top brass would have been removed from control immediately after it violated its constitutional duty to stay out of foreign policy determinations.

BIPARTISANSHIP DEAD

Mr. President, I point out to my Democratic colleagues that under this administration there has been no bipartisan foreign policy at any time, from the time the present President of the United States took his oath of office after his election in 1952 to date. Oh, there have been some conferences with leaders now and then at the White House. I am afraid some of my Democratic colleagues have permitted a little window dressing to go a long way with them. The honor of being briefed has taken the place of real consultation.

The Democratic Party has had no voice in helping to determine American foreign policy under the Eisenhower administration. There has been, in fact, no bipartisan foreign policy. That is why I am always surprised when I pick up the newspapers and read statements by Democratic leaders rubber stamping a foreign policy, after the fact, of the Eisenhower administration.

Mr. President, of course, in an hour of crisis we can always be counted upon to close ranks behind any President of the United States, Republican or Democrat. But I am one Senator who is not going to close ranks behind a President in connection with a wrong foreign policy prior to our getting into a situation where we are at war and before we have exhausted every possibility of correcting a wrong foreign policy by a wrong President. Mr. President, this President of the United States has been wrong many times on foreign policy since he has been in office.

I offer no apology to the American people. I am proud to let my descendants read my record of dissent with this President in regard to foreign policy time and time again.

Well I remember my refusal in 1955 to go along with the Formosa resolution and the warning which the Senator from New York and the Senator from Oregon gave the Senate on that historic occasion—that the Formosa resolution would settle nothing, that the Formosa resolution would increase the danger of

war. So it has, Mr. President, and that danger is increasing year by year.

DEMOCRATS FAILED TO SUPPORT UNITED NATIONS

Mr. President, I think it is well understood that within the next few years Red China will have nuclear weapons. Can we think that the Formosa resolution, at that time, is going to be a contribution to peace? If the Democrats had not followed Eisenhower on the Formosa resolution in 1955, if they had supported the Senator from New York and the Senator from Oregon, as we pleaded on the floor of the Senate, taking a position of seeking to get the United Nations to accept a trusteeship over the Formosa Straits, with the United States guaranteeing to the United Nations that it would militarily defend Formosa and the Pescadores, we would be nearer to peace in the Formosa Straits than we are today.

But the Democrats rubberstamped what I consider to be that wrong foreign policy of this administration, which was a foreign policy, again, outside of the United Nations, and which represented once again the record of the Eisenhower administration for unilateral action outside the United Nations rather than through it.

History will record that the Eisenhower administration has bypassed the United Nations time and time again on the major issues which have threatened the peace of the world. The Middle East doctrine is another example. Once again the majority of the Democrats rubberstamped it. More of them stood with us on that than in regard to the Formosa Straits, Mr. President, but even in that instance we heard the pleas for unity. We heard the plea, "You cannot let the President down." We heard the plea, "The President, right or wrong."

That is dangerous doctrine, Mr. President. We have a duty, as Senators—at least, as I see my obligation, I do—to try to correct a wrong Presidential policy. I say, most respectfully, that we Democrats have done a rather poor job of that under this administration. I am glad to see that eyes are, at long last, opening, and at least the Democratic voters of this country—and I will also say, many fine independent and Republican voters of this country—are beginning to recognize that the Eisenhower administration foreign policy, if long continued, is going to lead us into war.

That policy has to be stopped, Mr. President. We have to stop it by stopping our support of the President of the United States every time he circumvents the United Nations, every time he resorts to secret diplomacy, and every time he keeps from the American people the facts about our foreign policy which endanger the people.

DEMOCRATS MUST OFFER ALTERNATIVES

Mr. President, it is one thing to criticize the Republican foreign policy but it is another thing to tell the American people a constructive program which ought to take its place. That is the responsibility of the Democratic Party, in my judgment. We must come forward with a constructive program,

1960

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

10033

rather than constantly be sneezing as Eisenhower coughs, on foreign policy, rather than constantly standing up in the Congress of the United States to plead for unity behind the President on a wrong foreign policy. We have, first, a duty to lay out what is wrong with the administration's foreign policy; and then to offer a constructive program to replace it.

Mr. President, I like the way Adlai Stevenson talks. I like the way Adlai Stevenson thinks.

I like the programs which Adlai Stevenson has presented to the American people for a number of years. I remember the courage of Adlai Stevenson in 1956 in regard to nuclear testing. That was the act of a great man; and we all know the smear job that was done against him by the Republicans in 1956. They were talking then as Nixon has been talking in the past few days—"You are an appeaser if you criticize American foreign policy."

Let me point out that if we do not start criticizing the Eisenhower administration foreign policy, if we do not bring some reforms in regard to it, and if the Democratic Party does not begin in the Congress by offering constructive suggestions to replace the Eisenhower foreign policy, I repeat that within a few years we shall be at war; and out of that war there will be no victory for the United States and the Western Powers, or for Russia. It will not be the end of civilization; it will merely be the end of American civilization and Russian civilization. There will be much civilization left, but it will be in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, because I am satisfied that a nuclear war would be bound to result in the simultaneous destruction of the civilizations in Europe, the United States, and Russia. I do not think there is any way of stopping it once the trigger is pulled on the first hydrogen bomb. There would be such a chain reaction of the pulling of triggers that it would be merely a matter of days until we had only a remnant of Western civilization and Russian civilization.

So I say to the Democratic Party that the time has come for it to come forward with a constructive program to meet the threat of war, because if we continue the program of the Eisenhower administration, in my judgment our country will end up with war in a very few years. I have said before, and I say again, that if we get into a critical war in which aggression is committed against us, of course we will stand united behind whoever is the President of the United States for the duration of that war, if we have any chance at all of surviving, which I think is highly remote.

Mr. President, I do not share the Democratic talk that we must not even whisper and criticize the Eisenhower policies with regard to foreign policy. In my judgment President Eisenhower and his administration have gotten us into the precarious position we occupy in this dark hour in American and world history. I think the time has come for us to give some heed to the statesmanship of a Stevenson and to the statesmanship

that is set out in the point of view expressed today by the Advisory Council of the Democratic Party. The time has also come when we must offer some constructive suggestions as to how best to seek the peace through a total enforceable nuclear disarmament program.

MANY BELIEVE WE SHOULD FIGHT RUSSIA SOON

If my major thesis is correct—and I am satisfied it is—that this nuclear armament race is immoral, that this nuclear armament race will never stand the moral judgment of history which follows us, then we ought to be at work trying to win the peace, rather than giving aid and comfort to those within our country who are trying to sell the sinister propaganda across America, "We must fight Russia some time anyway; we are probably in a better position to fight her now: So let us get on with fighting her."

My heart is heavy when I reflect on how widespread that sinister propaganda already is. We call it the preventive war theory, an expression which I have heard from the lips of the high brass in this country. In 1955 I argued against the Formosa resolution because I knew the testimony before us had disclosed that we were considering a preventive war resolution. I again raise my voice in opposition to preventive war propaganda in the United States.

If we continue to follow the policy of the Eisenhower administration we shall end with a preventive war, but I do not think it is too late to win the peace. It will call for some courage. It will call for the raising of horizons. It will call for the return to and the putting into practice of a great American ideal.

I know that when I raise my voice lustily and make a plea for implementing a system of international justice through law my critics are heard to say, "That is what happens when you put a professor in politics. He goes idealistic on you. He goes theoretical on you. He becomes impractical."

I have many answers to the criticism, but I will give only one at this moment in the form of a rhetorical question: I would have these critics tell the American people what is practical about a nuclear war. What is practical about a nuclear war? I can think of no greater impracticality.

Even when the war would be over such civilization as would survive for centuries would live in chaos, because if we stop to reflect for a moment on the chaotic conditions of this globe following a nuclear war, the sad thing is that all the problems which confronted us before the war would have to be solved by the world that remained after the war. The war would solve nothing.

We are told that it would get Russia out of the way. I am satisfied it would get Russia out of the way—and the United States, too; and I do not wish to see the United States put out of the way. I think we have the system of government, and a system of ideals which come nearest to making it practically possible to implement the great spiritual beliefs and teachings to which we are all dedicated as religious men and women in this country. What concerns me so much is that the course of action which

we are following cannot be reconciled with those spiritual principles.

CONSTRUCTIVE ALTERNATIVES NEEDED

So once again I plead this afternoon for an effort to implement a system of international justice through law; and I make these suggestions, which I hope will be considered constructive.

First let me say, before I submit such a list, that no one can hold any brief for the course of action the United States took in regard to the spy plane, and no one can hold any brief for the course of action that Khrushchev took, either.

I am a member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate; and as a member of that committee I know the huge sums of money within our authorizations which are going into so-called intelligence work which is but a polite name for spy work. Everyone else ought to know, and I presume does know, that, of course, we spend great sums of money for espionage, and so does every other powerful nation. Of course, we have spies in many parts of the world and we know that other countries do, too, including some of our friends in our own country.

We certainly have no doubt about the fact that Russia had spies. But I was highly amused to hear the alibi given by the Vice President of the United States, Mr. Nixon, in talking about the spy plane incident. He sought to attract attention to the fact that there had been a couple Russian spies detected in Massachusetts some months ago.

That is no surprise to anybody. But if I have ever listened to a non sequitur argument, that is one, and I am accustomed to hear such arguments from the Vice President of the United States. What does the detection of intelligence personnel have to do with a course of action followed by the United States in regard to what is interpreted around the world as a form of constructive aggression? That is exactly what the sending of the spy plane over Russia was. It was a form of constructive aggression. We can alibi it and rationalize it all we want to, and we can wave the American flag into tatters over it, but the fact remains that our friends and enemies alike around the world are going to decree that we cannot justify our course of action in the spy plane incident under international comity well recognized in the field of espionage.

At no time, as I sat in the Committee on Foreign Relations or on the floor, and as I voted for the use of funds for intelligence work, was there even a whisper from anyone within the administration, military or civilian, that any of that money would be used for the sending of an instrumentality of war over a foreign sovereign power.

I am satisfied that if any such suggestion had been made, the result with respect to the request for authorization would have been a great deal different, both in committee and on the floor of the Senate. The administration did great damage to the standing and prestige of the United States by following a policy which has shocked our friends around the world in sending an instru-

10034

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 23

mentality of war in the form of a spy plane over Russia.

Let us not forget, in these days of high hysteria, bordering almost on panic, in the thinking of many people, one never knows when such an incident will cause some misguided, uninformed, emotionally aroused person in some foreign country to make a false deduction as to the purpose of such a plane, and a nuclear war will be started thereby.

It was a risk that the administration had no moral right to ever run. They ran it. The plane was shot down. I do not know what the facts are. We hope to get the facts after a thorough investigation. I do not know yet how the plane was shot down.

I am not convinced by any statement coming out of this administration that it was not shot down by a land-to-air missile. There are reasons to doubt the statement. I am satisfied that this administration would like to save face, if it can, with regard to this unfortunate and stupid mistake it made. I do know that one of the pleas made to us for a long time in the Senate for crash programs in connection with the development of land-to-air missiles was that, we were told—and I violate no secrecy by saying this, because this has appeared in periodicals and press reports throughout the country—that the Russians were ahead of us in land-to-air missiles.

The result was that huge sums of money were appropriated for Bomarc—over \$3 billion. On the basis of the latest findings, the record of Bomarc is not so good. Of course we know, when we appropriate huge sums of money for these programs, that some of them are not going to be the success we hoped they would be, and that some of them are going to be failures. I am not greatly concerned about the fact that we appropriated that money. The program apparently resulted in failure. I would vote to do it again. I will do it tomorrow if the administration can come forward with a program that shows an appropriation may help us speed up a crash program on land-to-air missiles. I say that because I have voted in the past and will continue to vote in the future for those appropriations which are necessary to let the Russians at all times know that they have everything to lose and nothing to gain by an aggressive course of action against the free world.

WEAPONS ARE NOT ENOUGH

What I am trying to bring before my country is that merely an arms race will not win the peace. An armaments race will not do that but, in my judgment, will surely assure a nuclear war in our time. That we cannot justify, unless we know that we have done everything that possibly can be done by moral people to try to set up a system of international justice through law which can enforce a total disarmament program.

Khrushchev shot the plane down. One would expect it from an amoral people. International comity and recognized principles of international morality dictated that he not follow that course of action. He has one of the best jet fighter armadas in the world. There are

some people who think that they are better than our own. I am not expert enough to testify on that.

However, I raise the point that it is good enough so that there is great concern on the part of our experts as to the comparison between our jet fighter armada and Russia's. All he needed to do was to send three or four of his jet fighters to that plane and surround it and give it orders to ground itself. If it violated that request, then and only then, in my judgment, under the rules of international law, in such a situation, would he have been justified in shooting it down.

He did not follow that course. I have a hunch that he saw a great opportunity. He knew as well as we did that Bomarc has been no great success, and he seized the opportunity to make a demonstration to the world in regard to land-to-air missiles. I think that is a great probability. Be that as it may, he did get a great propaganda advantage over us. Then, having followed that course of action, he went to the summit undoubtedly with a determination to humiliate not only the President of the United States, not only the Presidency of the United States, but also the American people. He wanted to bring into disrepute the President as a man, the position, and the American people.

PRESIDENT DID WELL AT PARIS

Although I have been highly critical of President Eisenhower's foreign policy on many issues, I wish to say that the President went as far in the Paris conference as he could go with honor. He deserves credit for announcing at the very beginning that it was the plan of this Government to suspend any further use of spy planes. That should have been said, and that is all that the President needed to say, if Khrushchev really wanted to have the summit conference be a vehicle and a forum for negotiation and agreement on peace.

Obviously, he did not want that. Therefore, I wish to say that in my judgment the President of the United States conducted himself at the Paris conference within the proprieties, and Khrushchev did not.

I listened to Khrushchev's press interview. I could close my eyes at times during that interview and almost come to the conclusion that I was listening to Hitler, because there were sections of the interview which had many of the characteristics and overtones and undertones of the type of totalitarian propaganda that Hitler preached at his height.

Be that as it may, Khrushchev is a reality. Be that as it may, Khrushchev is at the head of a government that obviously is our potential enemy. Therefore, I believe that, with honor and within procedures that will protect the security of our country, we must proceed now to find out what we can do and to answer the question, "Where do we go from here?"

I am not one to cry over spilled milk. It is better to survey the facts that get us into a position in which we find ourselves at any given time.

But after I have surveyed that position, then I always ask myself the ques-

tion: Where do we go from here? The Russians apparently thought that they might get more propaganda value having this matter referred to the Security Council. I think we all know that the Security Council cannot solve it, and undoubtedly will not solve it.

There is not much hope that the Security Council can solve the great problem which confronts us, the problem of winning the peace, by bringing about a sure-proof, enforceable, total disarmament program in our time. I am not an "overnighter." I recognize that such a peace will not be won overnight. It will not be won in 2, 3, or 5 years.

In fact, to secure such a peace probably will consume many years. However, I want to stress that we ought to be taking forward steps toward winning the peace, rather than marching in reverse, as we are at present. I am satisfied we are marching toward war not toward peace. So I wish to make a few suggestions this afternoon which I think we ought to try to implement in the years immediately ahead.

If we do the negotiating within the framework that I suggest this afternoon; if we have the nations of the world negotiating for peace; then, interestingly enough, we will have a form of moratorium on war at the same time, because if the nations of the world are negotiating for peace, the probability will be increased that they will not proceed to fight one another in a war.

ROLE OF RED CHINA NEEDS TO BE UNDERSTOOD

So there are a few reforms which I think we ought to stand for in the field of foreign policy as it affects all nations. Let me stress the word "all" for a moment, because no longer can we divide the world into those nations with whom we will converse, and those nations against whom we will drop an American iron curtain.

Of course, I refer specifically to Red China. No one in this body hates the form of government of Red China more than does the senior Senator from Oregon. Nevertheless, we are following a blind, myopic policy with respect to Red China, because I am satisfied that Red China will be a nuclear power within 10 years. We cannot possibly start negotiating for peace leading toward a total disarmament program, and not include Red China.

This does not mean that the senior Senator from Oregon advocates the immediate recognition of Red China. I do not; although I point out to the American people that Red China has never asked to be recognized. Red China has never made a request for diplomatic recognition on the part of the United States.

However, I hope the time will come when we can recognize Red China with honor to ourselves. We cannot do that now. We cannot do it until we get some very definite proof that we can rely on the commitments of Red China which will show that we can count upon Red China to keep her international commitments.

There are two such commitments which we have the right and also the

much in the same way that the great common law was built up. The common law is a body of judicial precedents; and we should now be engaged in the process of building up a body of precedential law for international-law tribunals to apply to disputes which threaten the peace of the world, as they arise from year to year.

But more than that must be done. We also must expand international law by "a statutory process or procedure." I suggest that we can do so by calling a series of extraordinary sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations from time to time, with the agenda limited to specific questions for debate and negotiation, the purpose being to arrive at the adoption of resolutions, with the understanding that they will have the force and effect of international law until they are repealed. Is that idealistic? Yes, it is. Is it theoretical? Yes, it is. Is it practical? It is highly practical, because, as I have said before, the only thing that is practical happens to be to put to work an ideal in the field of foreign policy and also in the field of governmental domestic policy.

But the sad thing is that the Eisenhower record on this matter is practically nil; and the sad thing is that too many Democrats have rubber stamped the Eisenhower position on that issue.

It is time for the Democratic Party either to fish or to cut bait on the matter of foreign policy, and in the months ahead to come forward with a constructive foreign program which will lead to peace, instead of the Republican program which rapidly is taking us down the road toward war.

A series of such conferences over the years—and let it be remembered that earlier in this speech I pointed out that I am discussing a program which, in my judgment, may take as long as 20 years but, nevertheless, we should get on with the work, and should have conferences of the sort I have suggested—through special sessions of the General Assembly, will, in my judgment, promote the cause of peace and strengthen the chances for peace, and will bring us closer to a total nuclear disarmament program, without which, in my judgment, in our time we shall wind up with a nuclear war.

PEACE OFFENSIVE NEEDED

But for the immediate future—and I close with this suggestion—I believe we have a right to look to our allies around the world to rise to their obligations at this hour. I believe the heads of great governments, such as those of Great Britain, Canada, France, Italy, and India, those of all the free nations of the world—ought right now be joining in focusing attention on the need for the adoption of a system of international justice through law for the settlement of these disputes, leading to a total disarmament program.

If ever there was a time when the United States needed the moral support and backing of her allies, that time is now; and I am speaking of the need to take to Khrushchev a peace offensive within and through the United Nations.

But we are not doing so, because time and time again we have demonstrated that we are not willing to submit specific questions to the processes of the United Nations for final determination. So I make the plea that our allies join in asking for an extraordinary session of the United Nations in the immediate future, because, in my judgment, it has got to be done through the General Assembly, not through the Security Council. In the first place the Security Council cannot speak for all the nations in the world, and only a few nations are on the Security Council. But every nation, large and small, has a stake in peace. Every nation, large and small, has a stake in what the United States, Great Britain, France, and Russia do.

SUMMIT MEETING SHOULD NOT BE HELD AT U.N.

That is why I have been heard to say before, as I protested the kind of summit conference that was called in Paris, that, in my judgment, we should not proceed in that kind of summit conference. I think it was a mistake from the beginning.

Any summit conference in which we participate, as I have said for a long, long time, should be conducted under the jurisdiction of the United Nations, with the Secretary General of the United Nations sitting as permanent chairman of that conference, and with any arrangements or agreements reached in that summit conference going to the United Nations for approval.

Why? Because if that is not done, in my judgment we shall return to international power politics. International power politics will not produce peace. It never has. The use of international power politics, throughout the history of mankind, has produced only intervals between wars, because always the nonparticipants resent the fact that a few powerful nations decide the fate of the rest of the world.

I make it a point of getting myself briefed on broadcasts coming from southeast Asia, Latin America, and Africa. I say to Members of the Senate they had better get themselves briefed on what is coming out of southeast Asia, Africa, and Latin America these days. Those radio broadcasts indicated to me that loud dissents were already beginning to arise among the nonparticipants at the summit conference, and questions were being asked.

One can call it any kind of propaganda he desires; nevertheless, it is a reality. One cannot deny that it is being beaten into the eardrums of millions and millions of people in that part of the world, people who in numbers greatly exceed our population, and people who have to be won over to freedom if freedom is to survive. In my opinion, freedom will not survive if it is limited to the United States and the Western nations. It will survive in the decades ahead only if we win over to freedom the people in those parts of the world to which I have referred.

Mr. President, we will not sell international politics to them. They want none of it. Why should they? Would we?

I heard it said earlier this afternoon by the Senator from Pennsylvania or the Senator from Oklahoma—I think it was the Senator from Pennsylvania—when he quoted extensively from the Stevenson Chicago speech, from which I quoted a few minutes ago, what the reaction would be in our country in case a Russian spy plane was over our country. We know what the reaction would be. Can we not hear the clamor? There would be those who would want to break off diplomatic relations immediately. There would even be those who would want us to go to war.

In regard to the matter of international power politics, there are millions of people who want none of it; but they can be brought along, and they will cooperate if we give them a voice. That is why I made the suggestion, in which I hope our friends around the world will join us, and I hope our country will exercise leadership in proposing, that we start, in the immediate future, in the United Nations building in New York City, a series of conferences open to the world, to which will be invited the head of every state in the world, large and small, for the purpose of laying down the blueprint for peace, of telling the world the concessions he is willing to make in behalf of his country, for the cause of setting up a system of international justice under law, with the immediate goal of total disarmament, to be enforced by a police system agreed upon by the United Nations to enforce such a disarmament program.

I know there are those who will say, "Too idealistic. Too theoretical and impractical." But again I ask the question, What is practical about a nuclear war?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. In just a second.

I think the world is up against it, and I think the world has no choice but either to go to war in our generation or to give the world a system of permanent peace, which can be attained only by bringing to an end this immoral nuclear armaments race.

I yield for a moment to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I wish to commend the Senator from Oregon for the fine speech he is making in support of a peaceful solution of the world's difficulties. I thank him for joining me and the Senator from Oklahoma and a number of other Senators earlier today, who made the specific point that our job is to continue that search for peace, regardless of the calamities and blunders which resulted in the breakup of the summit conference. While it is important to establish what went wrong in the summit conference, and who made the mistakes, and why, the more important matter is not to be turned aside from the one great goal of this generation, which is peace, and cessation of nuclear testing, and surrender of nuclear weapons, and international agreement to bring about world peace through world law.

Our zeal in that cause should not be abated one iota by reason of anything that has happened in the world in the last 6 weeks.

duty, it seems to me, to ask of her, in order to demonstrate to the world that the United States stands upon its principles of recognition. One of those criteria is the criterion that a nation must demonstrate to us or satisfy us that we can count upon it to keep its international commitments.

So I refer to the allegations which we have made, over and over again, and which I think were merited, that Red China has violated the Korean truce time and time again. The second allegation is that Red China has not followed the recognized procedure of civilized nations in respect to the treatment of our captured nationals. We must ascertain the facts.

Therefore, I suggest that as a condition precedent to any proposal that the United States recognize Red China diplomatically, the United States, through the United Nations, ought to ask Red China to permit a survey or an investigation to be made by an appropriate team of the United Nations concerning the extent, if any, to which Red China has kept to her international commitments in respect to the Korean truce, and in respect to her treatment of American nationals whom she has allegedly tried in her courts and sentenced to various types of punishment in Red China.

Does anyone think for a moment that the United States would object to a similar survey to be made by the United Nations in the United States, in case any sovereign power alleged that we were violating the well established principles of civilized nations in the matter of handling prisoners, or in the living up to our treaty or truce obligations? Of course we would not?

The point I am making is something different from that of diplomatic recognition. I am simply asking for recognition of the fact that if an attempt is made to work out a disarmament program, a part of the world cannot be left out of that disarmament program. It does not follow that because we recognize the right of Red China to a voice in negotiations with respect to worldwide disarmament, we are, in effect, thereby diplomatically recognizing her.

U.N. VETO POWER SHOULD BE ELIMINATED

So if we expect to establish a system of international justice through law, which will promote and attain total nuclear disarmament, then we must look to the existing procedures available to us. When we do that, we see that many of those procedures will have to be changed. We ought to be exercising leadership in making proposals for a change in the international rules which already exist in those organizations of which we are already members.

Thus I refer to the veto power of the United Nations. Certainly, that power must be eliminated. We know the history of the veto power. There are those who have written authoritatively and spoken authoritatively of the San Francisco Conference and have pointed out that when the American delegation at that Conference split over the veto issue, then the veto became a certainty,

because the Russians were insistent upon the veto power.

Many persons at the San Francisco Conference were against the veto power. But when the American ranks broke over the issue, then there was no question, from that time on, that the veto power would go into the charter, and it did. It finally became a part of the charter, as the record shows, and with the vote of the American delegation, too. That was a great mistake.

There were only a few of us on the floor of the Senate at the time the San Francisco charter came before this body for ratification, and who spoke against the veto power in the charter. It was obvious at that time that that particular section of the charter was bound to rise to plague us, and it has risen to plague us many, many times.

It will not be possible to have the veto power removed immediately, but I believe it can be removed. As we marshal the leaders of the world behind a request for a modification of the veto power, in due course of time the Russian leaders themselves will come to recognize that they will have to assume the responsibility for losing the peace, if they are unwilling to make a concession in a matter which makes so much commonsense as the elimination of the veto power. I do not know how many years it will take, but I believe that the very discussion of it, that the making of it the subject of one or more special sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations for world debate, discussion, and resolution, if possible, will have an effect on the exercise of the veto during the period of time the discussion is taking place.

The discussion of these problems, in and of itself, will further the cause of peace in the international councils of the world as they are carried on through the procedures of the United Nations.

U.N. MUST BE CORNERSTONE OF U.S. POLICY

Third, I suggest that the time has long passed—is long overdue—when the United States also will serve notice on the world that we are going to stop our end runs around the United Nations; that we are going to stop circumventing the United Nations, that we are perfectly willing to lay our cases on their merits before the procedures of the United Nations, before the tribunals of the United Nations, before the General Assembly of the United Nations, for open world surveillance.

Therefore, Mr. President, I think public opinion in this country should give heed to the need of the United States to notify the world that we are going to help strengthen the United Nations, instead of continue to weaken it.

INTERNATIONAL LAW MUST BE STRENGTHENED

Fourth, I wish to point out that there is no existing body of international law sufficient in depth to be applied to all the international issues which arise to endanger the peace. International law, as it now exists, is, after all, very limited in scope. Therefore, if we are to set up a system of international justice through law, we must expand the existing body of international law, so that as each

threat to the peace arises, as each dispute between and among nations occur, there will be a set of principles which can be applied for the adjudication of those disputes, thus eliminating the kind of policy the United States has been following, namely, one of threatening massive retaliation, of proposing to keep 25 percent of our bombers in the air at all times, loaded with nuclear bombs.

What a shocking bit of news that was when it went around the world. How shocking it was to make such a statement, and then profess that we are seeking peace, when people in other parts of the world know that the nuclear weapons on any one of those bombers could go off by accident or by design or by disobedience of orders, and could start a holocaust. We have to start to square our actions with our talk for peace; and such a proposal as that is not a proposal of peace, but threatens war. Instead, we must have something to supplant the American policy of military threats.

The sad thing is that around the world we have the reputation—and with cause—of being threateners, just as Khrushchev has the reputation of rattling the saber. One of the sorriest things in the history of this administration was the proposal for mass retaliation; and the sad thing is that the Democrats as a body did not oppose it. Too many Democrats went along with that proposal, and, in my judgment, aided and abetted the Eisenhower administration in following the wrong policy for some 8 years.

If we are to expand international law, so there will be a body of law to which we can turn before international tribunals, if rule and reason are to be applied to international disputes, we must be willing to submit disputes which are subject to adjudication under existing international law to the tribunals of the United Nations which are provided for the handling of such cases. But we do not do so in regard to any matter of consequence. We may do so in regard to some little fishing dispute or some minor dispute in regard to a vessel or in regard to a question about harbor damages. But when there is a major issue, such as that over the Formosa Straits or that in regard to the Middle East or a good many issues which have arisen in connection with our mutual security program, we simply lean back and proclaim our sovereign rights, wave the flag, and say we are going to decide this for ourselves. But whenever we do that, we lose more and more prestige around the world.

So I suggest that we begin to apply the judicial articles of the United Nations Charter, and that we carry a peace offensive against Russia whenever we have a chance to do so, by calling upon Russia to join us in submitting disputes not only to the World Court, but, under the articles of the United Nations, also to other tribunals which can be set up by agreement under the judicial article of the United Nations Charter, for the settlement of such disputes.

That will start expanding international law with a body of precedents,

1960

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

10037

I ask the Senator from Oregon if that is not the great task which lies before America as the leader of the free world, and whether we do not have to create in the Senate a climate in which that task can be pursued assiduously, and in which those who do pursue it get the plaudits of this body, and not one in which there is a feeling that they are doing something unpatriotic or being soft on communism.

MR. MORSE. I could not agree more with the Senator from Pennsylvania. That is the burden of my whole speech this afternoon.

NATIONS SHOULD PUT BLUEPRINT FOR PEACE BEFORE U.N.

This is not the first time the Senator from Pennsylvania and the senior Senator from Oregon have stood shoulder to shoulder on the floor of the Senate in the interest of permanent peace. But I want to stress the fact that we have got to come forward with what I consider to be constructive, practical proposals for establishing that procedure. I have made specific references to those goals. The one point I was on—and I reiterate it—when I gladly yielded to the Senator from Pennsylvania, who has been so helpful on this speech, was that we should invite, and others must join us, the heads of all States, large and small, to participate in an extraordinary session of the United Nations, which has nothing to do with membership in the United Nations at all. I would like the head of every nation, large and small, whether that nation is a member of the United Nations or not, to have an opportunity to take a world platform in the United Nations Building in New York City and lay down his nation's blueprint for peace, and the concessions that nation is willing to make in order to establish what the Senator from Pennsylvania, I, and others in the Senate have been urging for many, many years in the Senate, namely, the establishment of a system of international justice through law for the purpose of enforcing peace.

Mr. President, that is going to take weeks and perhaps months. I am all in favor of taking as much time as we need, because, I repeat, if we have the heads of state around the world devoting themselves to the consideration of programs for peace, in my judgment, we shall have an unwritten moratorium on war. These nations are not going to be fighting each other so long as they are seeking to work out a peace program. I think we need that time, Mr. President.

I happen to think a tremendous amount of good can come from such a program as I am outlining, because I am satisfied there is not a spot on the world today in which the people are not greatly concerned about the danger of a nuclear war. The hearts of mankind, generally speaking—including, I am satisfied, the overwhelming majority of the rank and file people of the Soviet Union of Russia—want peace.

We know we are dealing with some irresponsible leaders in various parts of the world, but they happen to be a reality. We must stop, it seems to me, trying to escape from reality in this field of working for peace. We have to recog-

nize that at least those leaders whom we consider to be irresponsible have to be drawn out into the open. We have to carry to them and to the world, through the United Nations, the great ideals of the United States for peace.

I happen to think that even at the head of state level we might be in for some very pleasant surprises as to the amount of progress which could be made in developing a program for peace. People would have to come and go at the conference. I recognize that, in many instances, about all we could expect would be to have the head of state come to lay out his program. If a head of state did not want to come in person but wanted to send a foreign minister to speak on his behalf, that should be his right. I think most heads of state, however, would come themselves.

After the heads of state had laid out their programs, Mr. President, it would be necessary for them to go back to attend to administrative and executive duties at the heads of their governments. After the heads of state program had been laid out before the world I think the next step should be negotiations and diplomatic exchanges among the foreign ministers.

It is at that point, Mr. President, I think months could be spent, and very profitable negotiations could be had, again under the auspices of the United Nations, in trying to see what agreements and understandings the foreign ministers could reach.

Third, Mr. President, I propose, after the foreign ministers have done the best they can in regard to trying to reach an agreement upon the program for the various phases of this very important problem of peace, to which I have alluded this afternoon, that the recommendations and proposals go back once more to the General Assembly of the United Nations for the purpose of a determination of what agreements can be made within the United Nations, among the members thereof, at least with respect to a disarmament program.

Mr. President, highly theoretical as it may be dubbed, I happen to think this has a terrific amount of common sense, because if the leaders of the world really want peace the road I offer them is the road they should travel, toward the citadel and the cathedral of world peace, rather than the road which I think they may travel if we do not take spiritual leadership in the world, before it is too late—the road toward nuclear war. I do not think we have much time left. We have only our generation, at the most.

Franklin Roosevelt never spoke a greater truth than the truth he spoke in the depths of the depression, when he uttered the words which are more applicable today than they were in the depths of the depression, that our generation has a rendezvous with destiny. I think our generation, Mr. President, has a rendezvous with a great decision, war or peace. If the decision is war, America will be no more. If the decision is peace, then mankind will have the opportunity to rise to those great heights of civilization which still are

high for us to climb, the great heights which I believe God intended for us. But God also intended that we do our share, and that share calls at this historic hour, in my judgment, for our trying to lead the world into putting into implementation and practice the great, divine teachings which I think God intended us to follow.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I heard quite by accident a statement by the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon on television during the Oregon primary campaign, which I assume originated from Oregon. This was long before the collapse of the summit. I thought the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon in 2 minutes made more sense than any other statement I had heard on television. At that time the Senator spoke of the necessity for moving into the United Nations with this terribly important problem.

Would not the Senator from Oregon agree that after some 3½ years of trying to ease the tensions in the world, of trying to eliminate fear and suspicion, we are in a worse situation than we were in 3 years ago?

Mr. MORSE. There is no doubt about it. That is part of the burden of my speech this afternoon.

Mr. CARROLL. Would not the Senator from Oregon agree with the junior Senator from Colorado that we went into the so-called summit conference under the most adverse conditions? We had to have as our bargaining agent Mr. Macmillan of Great Britain or President de Gaulle of France. We were not there on equal terms. How much better would it have been if we had gone to the United Nations. Would not the Senator agree with that?

Mr. MORSE. I do not know what the record will show, but, as the Senator knows, I think the record will show that probably as many as four to six times, at the very beginning of the talk about having a summit conference 2 or 3 years ago, the Senator from Oregon spoke on the floor of the Senate against a summit conference held outside the United Nations.

From the very beginning, I have urged that all summit conferences be held under the United Nations, with the Secretary General serving as permanent chairman of the conference and with the understanding that the deliberations of such a conference and any proposed agreements reached would come to the General Assembly of the United Nations for approval.

I have said that for some years now because I think the United States is repeating a great mistake of history. We are participating in international power politics, in the kind of summit conference which was proposed. I think those are always bound to end in historic failure.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. Would not the Senator agree that at one time, in June

10038

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 23

of 1950, I think, when a serious crisis confronted the world, we met it through collective action through the United Nations in Korea? It was an unhappy event. We had to go to Korea. The results did not satisfy anyone, but at least we avoided world war III.

Would not the Senator agree that when we had the second great international crisis, in the Middle East, we again functioned through the United Nations?

I am no special champion of a theoretical United Nations, but I agree with the Senator from Oregon when he says that we must use the machinery of the United Nations when we are in a critical situation such as this. The United Nations should be used because not only big nations are concerned, but all the nations of the whole world will be affected in event of an atomic war. I should think all nations should be given a chance to find out what are the facts in this case.

May I say to the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] that I read the wire service reports on some of the violent attacks that were made today upon Adlai Stevenson and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. I was not on the floor at the time the remarks were made. I cannot understand the motivation. Have we reached the point in America where American citizens are not entitled to know whether the leadership of their Government has its fingers on the control of the military? Have we reached the point in our history when we cannot determine whether civilian authorities are supreme over the military?

I was not on the floor of the Senate at the beginning of the debate, but I heard the able Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. I have withheld any criticism of the failure at the summit until the President came back to American soil, because I did not want to embarrass him while he was on foreign soil. However, I think we now have held our fire long enough. I think we are now entitled to know the answer to this one question: Who initiated the U-2 flight on May Day? Why was it done on May Day? Who did it? Did the President of the United States know the flight was in motion?

Mr. MORSE. May Day is one of the great Russian holidays.

Mr. CARROLL. Exactly. Why did this flight take place virtually on the eve of the conference? Over 10 years ago when I was in the Congress I knew that there were forces within this Nation which believed in preventive war. I ask today whether there might be persons in the military who wished to torpedo the summit conference. Was there someone in the Central Intelligence Agency who wished to torpedo the conference? Perhaps there are people within these departments who do not desire to ease the tensions and have peace in the world.

These are the questions to which we are entitled to have answers, and as representatives of the people we are entitled to have our committees investigate and determine the answers. The Senator from Oregon sits on the important Foreign Relations Committee. I hope

that if the Committee on Foreign Relations conducts hearings, as the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is reported in the press to have predicted, these questions will be asked. I know the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] will be at every one of those hearings and he will attempt with all his might, power, and eloquence to determine this basic question: Why was this spy plane permitted to make its flight on May Day and just preceding the conference? Who was responsible?

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. If the Senator will permit me to make a further observation, I am frightened when I think of the possibilities of trouble arising from one of our outlying bases. We have delegated enormous power and authority to the military. The military are composed of human beings, and therefore are not perfect. Some military man could make an error in judgment and an atomic bomb might be released. That military man might set in motion a chain of events that could bring on the greatest man-made disaster in the history of the world.

We are living in a new age, in a new era, and Adlai Stevenson, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are among those who are saying the people are entitled to know our weaknesses and where the imperfections are in our society.

Who initiated the May Day flight? Was it done out of stupidity? Did our President know it?

It is not enough for the President to say, "I am responsible." Of course he is responsible because under the Constitution he formulates foreign policy. It is not a question of responsibility. The question is, Who did it? Who killed cock robin? Who did this monstrous thing? The American public are entitled to know the answer.

What I have said is not in criticism of the President of the United States. I wish to make that point perfectly clear. Such criticism on this issue at this time would be premature. Why? We need the facts, and that is why I commend the able Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], I commend the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] and others who say, "We are going to have a hearing." But let us not wait too long.

Following up the statement of the able Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], I suggest that only a fool today would believe that in 6 or 8 months all damage which has been done will be restored. All the fear and the suspicion that existed during the Stalin regime has now been greatly accelerated. It will not be 6 months, 8 months, a year or 2 years.

I can see only one course ahead and that is working together in the General Assembly of the United Nations. We cannot rely on the action of the Security Council because of its veto power. The General Assembly in discussing these issues can discuss surveillance of planes,

disarmament, and perhaps through this medium we can again remove some of the fear and suspicion. If we do not do so history will record that if this great Nation and the other leaders of the world among our allies do not get together to settle this question, there will not be much history left.

Mr. MORSE. Those who write will not be American historians. Perhaps some in Asia may write the history.

Mr. CARROLL. The Senator is exactly correct.

If the Senator will yield for one further observation, I have just had placed before me a news ticker dispatch which comes from Denver. This is a UPI dispatch.

DENVER.—The Denver Post said editorially today that Adlai Stevenson had a perfect right to criticize the administration's ineptness before the summit meeting and that "it is a proper subject for the political campaign."

The Post, which has supported the Republican candidate in the past two presidential elections, also said that former Democratic National Chairman James Farley "should know better about the proper role of the opposition in a democracy."

After Stevenson had criticized the administration's presummit activities Farley in turn criticized Stevenson for making the matter a political issue.

Stevenson had said the administration gave Khrushchev a crowbar with which to wreck the summit meeting through the U-2 plane incident.

The Post said in an editorial headed "Come Off It, Mr. Farley," that Stevenson "neither implied that the administration deliberately helped wreck the summit, nor did he hint that Americans were anything but united behind the President in his humiliating trials."

"But Stevenson did say that GOP tactics were very inept before the summit, which is true, and he did say that this is a proper subject for the political campaign, which is also true," the Post said.

Mr. President, the Denver Post is a Republican independent newspaper. The Denver Post twice gave its wholehearted support to President Eisenhower. It extolled his virtues day in and day out. But the editors also have courage. They have had the courage to point out the President's weaknesses time after time, whether they dealt with western reclamation, water pollution, or the depressed area problems which affect the State of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] so vitally.

The Denver Post has provided outstanding leadership in the Western States against the manner in which this administration has run the Federal Power Commission. The Denver Post has charged the FPC with failure to protect the public interest.

This newspaper then is one of the outstanding independent Republican newspapers in the Nation, standing most of the time, in my opinion, in the public interest. The reason I cannot give it a 100-percent rating is that it did not support me all the time. But it is a very fine newspaper, even though it did not support me in the last election.

Mr. MORSE. It even opposed me in Oregon before the last election.

Mr. CARROLL. I am not under any political obligations to the Denver Post,

1060

but I am pleased to tell my colleagues in the Senate that once again it puts its finger right on the issue. The issue is not an attack upon President Eisenhower. The issue is not an attack upon the President of the United States. The issue is crystal clear. The issue is whether the American people are entitled to know who is running their Government. If the President is running the Government, then who has sabotaged the cause of peace? We are not concerned especially with Khrushchev. We will take care of Khrushchev in our own time, but I agree with the Senator from Oregon that we ought to take care of Khrushchev and all his cronies in the forum of the United Nations and let the people of the world participate.

We do not have to give up our sovereignty. We have only one short opportunity left. The main point is that I am in support of the able Senator from Oregon. As I say, we have only one short opportunity left before some fool launches us into atomic war. I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Colorado very much for his wonderful contribution to my discussion on the floor of the Senate this afternoon.

I agree with almost everything he said. I certainly agree with his thesis. I am not at all surprised to find that there is opposition to Stevenson by the Republicans and the Farleys. We have opposition to Stevenson within our own party, as well as opposition by the Republicans.

There are those who are very anxious to see that he be not nominated at the Democratic convention. They recognize that, if nominated, unquestionably he will come out the victor. They have the right to oppose any nominee they wish to oppose. I am not at all surprised by Mr. Farley's criticism of Mr. Stevenson, because I am well satisfied as to where he stands in the fight within our party so far as the Democratic nomination is concerned.

The second thing I wish to say is that I reserve only one dissent from the observations the Senator from Colorado has made, and that was with respect to the course of action we followed with relation to the Middle East doctrine. In my judgment we did not make use of the United Nations procedure, as we should have. I made pleas at the time that we ought to take to the United Nations certain proposals for commitments from countries of the Middle East prior to exercising our right—and we have the right—to enter into agreements with those countries.

I felt at the time that we would have greatly strengthened the cause of peace if we had required or sought to require an agreement through the United Nations with respect to certain conditions before the fact, before we made the agreement under the doctrine.

But other than that the Senator from Colorado has expressed the thesis of the Senator from Oregon. Our difference is that I would have made greater use of the United Nations in that instance than we did. I am grateful indeed to the Senator from Colorado for strengthening my

record this afternoon as history will read it on the subject which I rose to discuss.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I ought to say, to keep the Record clear, that Jim Farley is my friend. We must remember that there are some political differences in the State of New York. For example, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt and former Senator Herbert Lehman support Stevenson. In 1956 Jim Farley was a strong Stevenson supporter. Now he may have another candidate. However, that is no reason for him to speak as harshly as he has about Adlai Stevenson. My able friend from Oregon, who is on the floor today, if he does not read it tonight, will probably read tomorrow morning, that another friend of mine, former President Harry Truman, is on the news wires today. He wrote an article for Look magazine, on Adlai Stevenson. This current article has nothing to do with the statement on the summit by Stevenson. However, he is not speaking in any commendatory terms about Adlai Stevenson. It is obvious that he has a candidate too. He has a right to have one. Therefore, I believe that people must look at these statements—

Mr. MORSE. I had one until last week.

Mr. CARROLL. Yes. The Senator from Oregon had a very good candidate. Many times good horses do not run strong for a short stretch. The junior Senator from Colorado has been that type of candidate. I have to have a longwinded campaign, sometimes lasting 6 or 8 years before I am successful. Some runners are not sprinters. I wish to say to the Senator from Oregon in conclusion, if I may, with respect to these statements, that I am absolutely convinced that Stevenson has a deep-seated feeling that this issue affects the survival of this Nation, and that he feels that we must raise this issue with the people of the Nation. I am confident that Stevenson did not raise this issue as a partisan political issue, but because he believes we must discuss these matters.

For more than 2 years the junior Senator from Colorado has been trying to stir up interest in Stevenson as a candidate. I do not know Governor Stevenson well. He is more an acquaintance of mine. I have met him only a few times. However, I look upon him as a great political and philosophical leader. He represents a new era in politics. I believe that is also true of JOHN KENNEDY. I think it is true of the new group that is emerging in the Democratic Party. I think it is true of other candidates. It is true of the distinguished Senator from Oregon. And that is nothing new about him. He has been ahead of the field for years. That is true of Senator SYMINGTON and Senator JOHNSON. I look about the chamber to see if there are any other candidates. [Laughter.]

We are moving into a new era. My friend the able Senator from Montana

has advocated—and I supported his resolution in 1957, when only a few of us stood here with him on the floor of the Senate—some supervision over the Central Intelligence Agency. I do not like the idea of voting money for an agency and not knowing a little about what it is going to be used for. Only a selected few Members of the body know what CIA is doing. I do not like that. I represent a million and a half people, and I am entitled to be able to go home and say to the people a little something about what the CIA is doing.

Mr. MORSE. Let me correct the Senator's statement on that point. There is not any select group in the Senate that knows what CIA is doing. I am a Member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. There are many things I cannot find out about what they are doing. They use the top secret label against us, too.

Mr. CARROLL. I can understand that some things ought to be kept secret. But we ought to have general knowledge about the guidelines and about the controls and about who gives orders and who makes reports.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to make this comment at this point. I do not think anything should be kept top secret without a check, under our system of government. It cannot be spread out worldwide, but at the same time I do not believe in vesting any branch of our Government with police-state power and top secret power, where there can be no check upon its administration.

That is a step in the direction of police-state powers. I have always opposed it. I happen to think that the elected representatives of the people can be trusted with the type of top secrets that any President or any head of the CIA can be trusted with. Most of the people who do have access to top secrets have never been elected to political office in their lives. So I do not buy the argument that we should not have a check on the President of the United States in respect to this matter of top secrets.

We can have a check on it without having it known throughout the country and known throughout the world. I am not going to give any man, even the President of the United States, unchecked power, because that is what brings about tyranny in times of crisis.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, of course I agree with that. The Constitution provides for that. I wish to make this personal reference. I had personal knowledge at one time that President Truman, when he was President, would get every morning at 9 o'clock a report from his intelligence liaison, so that he might know what was going on. He got those reports every morning. I assume that this is being done with President Eisenhower.

Mr. MORSE. Let us hope so.

Mr. CARROLL. There may be some things withheld from him. I reiterate this because I think it is very important. I think that all Americans are entitled to know, of course, who gave the order for the May Day flight. Why was it done on May Day? What was its purpose?

10040

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 23

Was it done stupidly, blindly; was it merely a colossal blunder, or was it some force working even against Eisenhower and against the administration, to blow up this conference? I think we are entitled to know what the facts are.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to say to the acting majority leader that I am about to yield the floor. Would he like to have me suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not at this time.

Mr. MORSE. I yield the floor.

YI YOUNG AN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1289, S. 2681.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2681) for the relief of Yi Young An.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, in line 8, after the word "said", to strike out "Yin" and insert "YI", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Yi Young An, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Staff Sergeant and Mrs. John L. Brown, citizens of the United States: Provided, That the natural parents of the said Yi Young An shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the pertinent parts of the report as they relate to the desirability of this measure.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (Rept. No. 1252) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to grant to the minor child adopted by citizens of the United States the status of a nonquota immigrant which is the status normally enjoyed by alien minor children of U.S. citizens. The bill has been amended to correct the spelling of the beneficiary's name.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

The beneficiary of the bill is a 19-year-old native of Korea, presently residing there, who was adopted in Korea on February 22, 1960 by citizens of the United States. He receives his full support from them. His adoptive father has served continuously with the Air Force since 1943 as a chaplain. After attaining the rank of lieutenant colonel he was retired under a reduction-in-forces program, and thereafter enlisted and is presently serving a tour of duty in Korea which terminates in June 1960. After retirement in 1963 he plans to resume his ministry in

the Southwest Texas Conference of the Methodist Church. The adoptive parents of the beneficiary were married in 1938 and have a 13-year-old daughter. Information is to the effect that they are financially able to care for him.

A letter, with attached memorandum, dated December 18, 1959, to the chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary from the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization with reference to the bill reads as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION
SERVICE,

Washington, D.C., December 16, 1959.

HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: In response to your request for a report relative to the bill (S. 2681) for the relief of Yi Young An, there is attached a memorandum of information concerning the beneficiary. This memorandum has been prepared from the Immigration and Naturalization Service files relating to the beneficiary by the Houston, Tex., office of this Service, which has custody of those files.

The bill would confer nonquota status upon the 19-year-old alien to be adopted by U.S. citizens. It also would provide that the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act. It is noted that there is a difference in the spelling of the beneficiary's name in lines 5 and 8 of the private bill. According to the records of this Service the correct spelling is Yi Young An.

As a quota immigrant the beneficiary would be chargeable to the quota for Korea.

Sincerely,

J. M. SWING,
Commissioner.

MEMORANDUM OF INFORMATION FROM IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE FILES RE YI YOUNG AN, BENEFICIARY OF S. 2681

Information concerning this case was obtained from Mr. and Mrs. John L. Brown, foster parents of the beneficiary.

Yi Young An, a native of Korea, was born on July 18, 1940. He has never been in the United States. He presently resides in Korea with Mr. Brown and is fully supported by him. The foster parents intend to adopt the beneficiary under the laws of the State of Texas when he arrives in the United States. The beneficiary is the son of Yi Man Sok and his wife, Pak Pun Sik, both residents of Korea. They have agreed to his adoption.

Mr. and Mrs. John L. Brown are U.S. citizens by virtue of birth in Athens, Tex., on October 30, 1912, and Calcasieu Parish, La., on February 28, 1910, respectively. They maintain their principal residence in Nome, Tex. Mr. and Mrs. Brown were married in Georgetown, Tex., on August 6, 1938, and have testified that this is their only marriage. They have a 13-year-old daughter, Doris Kay Brown. Mr. Brown has served continuously in the U.S. Air Force since March 3, 1943, and he plans to make the Armed Forces his career. His present rating is staff sergeant, and his annual income is \$4,200. Mrs. Brown is employed as a teacher in the public-school system at Nome, Tex., with an annual income of \$4,250. Their joint assets consist of \$14,200 in U.S. savings bonds, insurance with a face value of \$17,000 a checking account of \$6,000, and other real and personal property valued at \$5,000.

Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, the author of the bill, has submitted the following information in connection with the case:

21ST FINANCE DISBURSING SECTION,
APO 381, San Francisco, Calif.,

August 22, 1959.

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH,
Senator from the State of Texas,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE DEAR SIR: I am writing to inquire whether it would be possible for you to give me assistance in securing a special bill for the admission to the United States of a Korean national whom I plan to adopt in order that I might give him an education and other opportunities for development which I feel that I am in position to offer. For your preliminary consideration, I submit the following information:

I am 48 years of age, married (22 years), wife 49 years old. Both are in excellent health. We have one child 13 years old. Unfortunately after the birth of our daughter, we found that we could have no other children. I am a Methodist minister, of the Southwest Texas Conference; I served as a chaplain in the Air Force from March 1943 to February 1958, at which time I became a victim of the reduction-in-forces program. I still hold my Reserve commission in the grade of lieutenant colonel. After the reduction-in-forces, I enlisted in the Air Force in order to qualify for retirement. Upon retirement (1963) I will again resume my place in the conference as a pastor or missionary. I feel that I am financially able to undertake this project (if one can call an act of love for another a project) without any strain on either my financial or physical well-being.

The young man, whom I plan to adopt (or sponsor), is 18 years old. He has lived with or worked for Americans since the age of 10. He is the third son in the Korean family. Although both his parents are living, they are agreeable to both the adoption and his emigration from Korea. This boy has worked for me during my tour in Korea, and from observation—and closely at that—I can honestly say that I have never met a young man with a higher character quality than this lad. In spite of the many temptations which have presented themselves to him while in his status as houseboy to the GI's, he has never adopted the profanity or loose moral habits so common to many of the other "boys" who find it profitable to cater to the wishes of the man they work for. His habits and character bespeak the excellent family background from which he comes. Both his mother and father are practicing Christians—Methodists. His older brother, who is now in the Republic of Korea Air Force, hopes to become a Methodist minister, if the opportunity could be found to further his education in that direction—which assistance I may be able to secure through the help of some local church which may sponsor his training. As for my boy, I plan to place him first in a special school or private tutor to prepare him for entrance into Lon Morris Junior College, Jacksonville, Tex., and then to Southern Methodist University. Because of the extreme poverty of the family all the sons, except the youngest, have had to stop school at the end of the free-school period, which roughly is equivalent to our grammar school. I have checked his school record and find that he stood sixth in the class of almost a hundred children. He has a ready and eager mind, and I feel that he will have no difficulty in pursuing his studies.

I shall appreciate your advising me of the proper steps I should take in this matter. I am due to return to the United States in March of 1960, and I should like very much to be able to take the boy with me as I go. If I have to await the normal quota for Korean immigration the time would be a minimum of 5 to 6 years, since he does not qualify for a student visa or passport. By

10232

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 25

to stop the expenditure of the money if the head of the agency says, "We need it. We want it. We are going to spend it."

This throws a little new light on a different budgetary procedure of the Appropriations Committee, and someone should bring it to the attention of the Senate, because it may happen again upon a contingency basis. I am delighted, indeed, that the very distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations is presently occupying the Presiding Officer's chair. This is a matter, I am sure, of great concern to him.

**VICE PRESIDENT NIXON ADDRESSES
ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE
NATIONAL SALES EXECUTIVES
ASSOCIATION IN BUFFALO, N.Y.**

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, New York State recently welcomed distinguished visitors when Vice President and Mrs. Nixon appeared in several upstate cities. In a notable address before the annual convention of the National Sales Executives Association in Buffalo, the Vice President discussed the causes and aftermaths of the breakup of the summit conference.

More importantly, perhaps, he dealt with what all of this may mean for the future and with what America's role must be in leading the world to peace and security. Of particular pertinence were his remarks on the need to extend the mutual security program without serious cuts.

Mr. President, so that this address may reach the wide readership it deserves, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**TEXT OF ADDRESS DELIVERED BY VICE PRESIDENT
RICHARD M. NIXON BEFORE ANNUAL
CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL SALES EXECUTIVES
ASSOCIATION ON MAY 18, 1960, AT BUFFALO,
N.Y.**

Tonight I want to talk to you about a major problem, certainly the problem that is in the mind of every person in this room and most of the people in this Nation and probably in the world. You have read and heard that the summit conference is over. Mr. Khrushchev has decided to return to Moscow and President Eisenhower, after his visit to Portugal, will return to the United States. And so people are asking questions: What does it mean? Why did it happen? Who was at fault? Mr. Khrushchev's answer is that the United States is at fault. He says President Eisenhower personally must assume responsibility because he ordered the flights which have occurred over the Soviet Union over the past 4 years for the purpose of obtaining information to guard against surprise attack against the United States and the free world. Mr. Khrushchev in effect has said that because of the U-2 incident, and because he was so shocked to learn that some of these flights had occurred and that the President had ordered them, the summit conference could not go forward. Then he went on to say he felt that no conference should be held now until the American people should have an opportunity to vote for another President and then possibly the climate might be changed.

Having said these things, of course, speculation immediately comes up as to whether

Mr. Khrushchev is right and whether these are the reasons for the conference breaking up. I will give you my own opinion, and I am not alone in this opinion; it is that the U-2 incident was not a reason for the breaking up of the conference by Mr. Khrushchev, but an excuse. I talked to the President by telephone today in Paris and he indicated that was his view and the view of other allied leaders to whom he had talked when he said, in effect, that the conference was broken up by Mr. Khrushchev for apparently contrived reasons.

What were the real reasons, then? We can only guess; I can only report to you what many of those who are experts in this field have projected as possible reasons for Mr. Khrushchev's actions in torpedoing the summit conference as he did.

First, there is the possibility that he may be under pressure economically in his own country and that he needed a "foreign devil," so to speak, to blame for the distress that may have been developing, and to excuse his government from failing to provide more consumer goods for his people. Second, there are those who believe that a possible reason for his acting as he did was pressure that he was under from Stalinists or extremists within the Soviet Government, who had never liked his line of so-called "peaceful coexistence" and "peaceful competition" and believe that a more aggressive line should be adopted. Third, there are those who believe that he may even be under some pressure from his Chinese ally, Mao Tse-tung, who publicly has indicated that he does not agree with Mr. Khrushchev in the "peaceful coexistence" line which Mr. Khrushchev had been following prior to the summit conference. There are others who believe that one of the reasons why he broke up this conference was that he was convinced, by reason of what President Eisenhower, President de Gaulle and Prime Minister Macmillan had said in the past few weeks, that he, Mr. Khrushchev, would be unable to get his way on the Berlin question; and that believing he was not going to get his way on the Berlin question; because of our firm position, in which we would be joined by our allies, he felt it was best not to participate in the conference at all, so that he would be free to act unilaterally.

These are some of the reasons that have been suggested. But whatever the reasons are, I will again repeat what I said at the outset: That the majority opinion seems to be that the real reason does not lie in the fact that the U-2 incident was so shocking to him.

Now if I may go to a second point. I believe that Mr. Khrushchev, in making his announcement that he was going to break up the summit conference, and in attempting to convince the world that he was doing it because of the U-2 incident, made three major mistakes in judgment.

One, he misjudged the intelligence and sophistication of the leaders of the world and the people of the world. These leaders and people could certainly not be taken in to believe that Mr. Khrushchev, who to put it in understatement is a master of espionage activities, would be so shocked to find that the United States was attempting to obtain information with regard to surprise attack in any method by which that information could be obtained. Certainly, I would think that most impartial observers would say he was the last person who would show shocked surprise at espionage activities. And so he misjudged the action and the temper of the world's leaders and people. Dispatches from all over the world indicate this because, although for a few days after the U-2 incident first hit the world's headlines there was support for Mr. Khrushchev, when he used this incident as an excuse for breaking up the conference, then that support drifted away;

now there seems to be almost unanimous condemnation of him as the one solely responsible for this action. This was his first mistake in judgment.

His second was in misjudging the President himself. Apparently Mr. Khrushchev thought that he, in effect, would be able to blackmail the President, to bully him, by threatening to break up the conference unless the President apologized for attempting to defend the United States through surveillance by aerial activities and also punished those who were responsible. The President would not pay this price, in my opinion properly could not pay such a price. He refused to apologize under the circumstances which Mr. Khrushchev had laid down in his conditions for his participation in the conference. And so he misjudged the President and the President's determination in this area.

In addition, Mr. Khrushchev, I believe, misjudged the character of the American people. And I speak now not as a Republican, or as a party leader, but as an official of this Government and as an American citizen. When he tried to imply, as he did, that by waiting for 6 or 7 months to pass and for the American election to occur, that the American electorate then might select as President of the United States another individual who would take a different line with regard to his threats than President Eisenhower was taking, I think he misjudged the American people and he misjudged both the great American political parties.

Because, my friends, we know that the great majority of Americans—regardless of their partisan affiliates—resents any attempt by Mr. Khrushchev, or anybody else outside this country, to interfere in an American election in such a flagrant and arrogant way. And second, I think we would all agree that regardless of party, Americans believe in the cause of peace with justice which the President was representing at Paris; and Americans believe that the President of the United States was fully justified in adopting a course of action to protect this country from another Pearl Harbor surprise attack through aerial surveillance.

I do not suggest that the conduct of the administration in this—or any other area—has been without mistakes. I only suggest that as far as the basic policies and the basic attitudes of the American people are concerned, we stand united against attempts by outsiders to interfere with our elections and for the principles of freedom, peace with justice, and the right of self-determination for the 2,500,000 people of Berlin and others throughout the world.

And so, having analyzed the events to date, may I turn to the future. What will happen now? What will Mr. Khrushchev do—and what should we do? Again, we are in the area of conjecture. I would first say that as far as Mr. Khrushchev is concerned, no one can predict what he will do on Berlin, or with regard to the disarmament conferences that have been going on, or with regard to the conferences on atomic tests, until at least a few days have passed and he is able to assess world opinion. Because one thing I have noted about Mr. Khrushchev, and one thing other observers have noted, is that he is very sensitive to world opinion, particularly the opinion in the so-called uncommitted areas of the world. I think Mr. Khrushchev will have to have his assessment of that opinion in mind as he develops his course of action for the future. If he does not have that in mind, he could lose many of the gains and the advantages that he presently thinks he has in the ideological conflict going on in the uncommitted countries of the world—between communism on the one side and the forces of freedom on the other.

Second, does Mr. Khrushchev want war? My answer is: I do not believe so. I share

1960

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

10231

Dr. Galbraith minimized the risk of bad faith in these words: "Some of our estimate of the danger of bad faith, we must agree, will be the residue of the bad feelings of recent years." With this sweepingly simple analysis of the cold war Professor Galbraith not merely succeeds in equating communism with democracy, but ignores the essential amorality of communism, its long record of perfidy and violated treaties. For my own part, I take it for granted that if there is enough to gain from cheating and if the cheating can be made reasonably safe, the Kremlin will cheat.

FACING CHOICE

What would the Kremlin gain from cheating? If the Kremlin were to get there first on the antimissile missile or the neutron bomb or on any other major technological breakthrough in nuclear weapons, my conviction is that we would in short order find ourselves confronted with a choice between annihilation and surrender.

How easy would underground cheating be? Even the most elaborate inspection system yet proposed would provide detection capabilities only down to the level of a 20-kiloton (Hiroshima) blast. For the life of me I see no point to any detection system which would cost several billion dollars to install and probably another billion dollars a year to operate, and which would leave the Communists free to sneak test any device up to the size of a Hiroshima-type bomb.

Even at levels much lower than 20 kilotons it is possible to do a tremendous amount of significant testing. Such testing would not merely be immediately applicable to the entire range of clean, tactical nuclear weapons but would be applicable, by extrapolation, to the development of improved or radically different strategic weapons.

RISKS INVOLVED

My estimate of the relative risks differs fundamentally from Professor Galbraith's attitude. I believe that the greater our numerical and technological preponderance in nuclear weapons, the smaller the chance of war. I believe that an effective nuclear test ban, if such a thing were possible, would not decrease the danger of war by one iota. I believe that a test ban or moratorium observed only by the open societies would greatly increase the danger of a thermonuclear holocaust.

I believe that the opinion of mankind could be respected and the security of the free world served by an agreement based on President Eisenhower's proposal of February 11. This called for a ban on all tests that contaminate the atmosphere and detectable tests in space and underground, for a joint research program on detection, and for the extension of the test ban to other areas as improved means of inspection were developed.

Unfortunately, we have now departed from this position and agreed in principle to a ban on undetectable space shots and a moratorium on undetectable underground tests.

I fear that by these concessions we have placed the free world in grave jeopardy.

THOMAS J. DONN,
U.S. Senator.

CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a very interesting editorial was published in the Wall Street Journal of May 17, 1960, under the caption "Conflict of Interests." I thought the significant statement in the editorial was the last, which is:

It is really a matter of determination of character. For a conflict of interest is to be found not in a man's bank box, but in his heart.

I think the editorial is worthy of reproduction and wider dissemination, so I ask

unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

Mr. Edward K. Mills, Jr., an attorney, has requested President Eisenhower to withdraw his nomination as a member of the Federal Communications Commission. It is impossible, Mr. Mills said, for him to divest himself of an interest in stock in the communications field to a degree that can be "regarded as sufficient."

It is impossible because the stock is held by a bank acting as trustee for a trust fund established by his family with Mr. Mills as beneficiary some years ago. It is impossible for Mr. Mills to sell his stock—as Mr. Wilson sold his General Motors stock at great personal sacrifice, as it turned out—because he doesn't own it or control it. But he could benefit from a rise in its value, or suffer from a drop in its value.

If ever a situation could point to the unrealistic policy of expecting men to divest themselves of property in order to serve their government, this one surely does so. As to Mr. Mills himself, there might be objection to some of the policies he announced. He would follow on the FCC; we certainly thought that he was going far afield in his proposals to raise the "standards" of TV and radio presentations by Government "persuasion."

But the irony is that if this were to be done on a broad enough scale, the TV and radio industries believe they would have lost revenues. So if anyone believes Mr. Mills might have acted in a way that would influence the value of the communications investments in his trust, they may very well be right. Mr. Mills might, while raising the standards of the industries he was to oversee, have succeeded also in lowering his own revenues.

We don't mean that the bars ought to be so lowered that no attention ought to be paid to possible conflicts of interest. But there are other and surer guides in our view. What is a man's reputation for honesty and integrity? That seems to us the better way to choose officials of Government agencies.

A crook could divest himself of everything and still remain a crook seeking high office for further crookery. An honest man will remain honest no matter what he owns or what temptations are placed in his way.

It is not really a matter of divestment. If it were, we ought to require all Secretaries of the Treasury to get rid even of their dollar bills—on the ground that a man might induce the Government to follow policies that could make the dollar more valuable and thus benefit himself.

It is really a matter of determination of character. For a conflict of interest is to be found not in a man's bank box but in his heart.

AGRICULTURE AND FARM CREDIT
ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATIONS,
1961—CONTINGENCY LANGUAGE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in the welter of things happening yesterday I had hoped to invite attention to one item in the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, but I was in and out of the Chamber so much during the day that I did not quite get around to it. However, I talked with some members of the committee and with other Senators with respect to the matter.

My comments relate to two items. First, in regard to the so-called Farmers Home Administration there was an appropriation provided and, in addition,

there was language to the effect that the Administration would be entitled to spend an additional \$40 million if it were required. It was my notion that perhaps the language ought to be safeguarded by requiring approval of the Bureau of the Budget, but there was some objection to doing so. Therefore, I did not offer the amendment.

I understand, however, that under the language as now carried in the bill, if the Administrator feels it is necessary to spend the money and goes to the Bureau of the Budget and insists upon having the additional money made available, the money must be made available.

The interesting thing about this matter is simply that we enlarge the expenditures for fiscal year 1961, but the enlargement does not show up in the budget total for that particular department.

A comparable provision was carried in the bill with respect to the Rural Electrification Administration, and made available an additional \$60 million for telephone loans and \$60 million for electrification loans, or a total of \$120 million. The Budget Director has told me that if the demand is made it is virtually impossible for him to resist it, so the money may be expended.

This is a total of \$60 million plus \$60 million plus \$40 million, or \$160 million. If the \$160 million is expended, then instead of the so-called \$135 million reduction in the budget figure as reported by the committee, actually there will be an excess expenditure over the budget figure.

This is not exactly back-door financing. This is a contingent appropriation. I become a little concerned about it, because instead of a back door it might become a trapdoor.

I did not want the legislative record to be closed on this matter without alluding to this. I am sensible of the fact that the language was incorporated in the bill as it came from the House of Representatives. The Senate did not modify the language and did not modify the amounts provided, but simply concurred in the action taken by the House.

I am pretty confident that those who are beset with budget problems and an effort to maintain a balanced budget are looking upon this with dubious eye, because they may feel the budget is in balance and suddenly discover the demand for the contingent amounts will be made. If such a demand is made and the money is expended in the fiscal year to come, then of course what now looks like a budget cut will really be an addition to the budget.

Perhaps, Mr. President, I should read into the Record the contingency language in one of these paragraphs. It is after the regular appropriation:

... and additional amounts, not to exceed \$60 million for each program, may be borrowed under the same terms and conditions to the extent that such amount is required during the fiscal year 1961 under the then existing conditions for the expeditious and orderly development of the rural electrification program and rural telephone program.

There is, therefore, no authority in the Bureau of the Budget or in the executive

they were shouting and at least a third of them were crying.

Why? We were the Vice President of the United States and his wife. Why? We represented a powerful country, but Mr. Khrushchev had been there just a month before—he represented a powerful country, and he had not received a welcome like this. Why? Because to the people of Poland behind the Iron Curtain under totalitarian government since World War II, America stood for something more than military strength and economic strength. It stood for freedom, for the hopes of people everywhere, for the right to be free, and for moral and spiritual values which have always been the great heritage of our Nation. This is something we should never forget.

And so tonight, may I tell you that in this hour of difficulty in this Nation's and the world's history, we can and should have faith—faith in our country, faith in our principles, and faith in our future. We should have that faith because of our strength, our military strength and our economic strength; but we should have it mainly because we're on the right side, the side of freedom, the side of justice, the side of peace with honor, the side of a nation that wants not an acre of territory nor an economic concession for any other person in the world. Standing for these things, America can and will, I am sure, help lead the forces of freedom and justice and peace to victory in the years ahead.

Thank you.

MOTION PICTURE BASED ON RICHARD FREDERICK'S BOOK, "THE INTERNS"

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, a motion picture based on Richard Frede's book, "The Interns," depicting the function and duties of interns in hospitals, is being made in Hollywood by Producer Robert Cohn for Columbia Pictures. I believe this picture will create considerable discussion of the manner of operation of modern hospitals and the way in which interns are treated.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a brief review of Mr. Frede's novel by Robert Cohn.

There being no objection, the review was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Hollywood and the motion picture industry and Producer Robert Cohn are making a motion picture out of Richard Frede's book, "The Interns." While the book, which is now in its third printing, will reach many thousands of readers, the screen as a mass medium will bring the message of the novel to many millions in this country and abroad. The story of what goes on behind scenes in a hospital will unquestionably cause many hospital boards and administrators to cast a searching look at their own domains. The beneficiaries of this will be the sick and injured of the country and everyone who requires hospitalization at any time in the future.

TRIBUTE TO JAMES W. MURPHY

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the entire Senate is saddened by the death on April 11, 1960, of James W. Murphy, senior member of the corps of the official reporters of the Senate.

As a Member of the Senate I feel deeply the loss of a dedicated, able public servant who, by his patience, his painstaking efficiency and his exceptional fund of knowledge in reporting

and editing an accurate account of the proceedings of the Senate, has been of immeasurable assistance to me and to all my colleagues in our work. And as an individual I grieve the loss of a friend, a friend whose loyalty, kindness, good humor, wit, and unfailing courtesy have enriched my daily life during the nearly half century I have known him.

James Murphy came to the office of the official reporters on December 7, 1896, and from that day on, for close to 64 years, he gave unstintingly of his time and his very considerable talents to serve the Senate. I am convinced that no reporter ever gave better service to any parliamentary body in the world.

With Mr. Murphy's passing there ended 108 years of continuous official Senate reporting by his family. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD itself, the Senate section of which our esteemed friend and his most capable staff so carefully prepared every day the Senate was in session, was established largely through the efforts of the first Murphy to serve as Official Reporter. Dennis F. Murphy, the uncle of James W. Murphy, was selected in 1848 by Senator John C. Calhoun to give the Senate verbatim reports instead of the summaries by which debates and proceedings of the body had been recorded up to that time; 25 years later the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as we know it today, came into being.

Dennis Murphy served as Official Reporter of the Senate until 1896, the year his 17-year-old nephew, James, joined the corps as an amanuensis. He was the fourth member of the family to enter the employ of the Official Reporters' Office; at that time his father, Edward V. Murphy, had been a reporter since 1860, and the elder Murphy served until his death in 1919. Another uncle, James J. Murphy, had been an Official Reporter from 1854 to 1874. In all, the four members of the Murphy family served the Senate as Official Reporters for a total of 191 years, a record I doubt any other family can approach in any line of government service.

In the nearly 64 years James Murphy reported the colloquies, debates and other proceedings of the Senate he recorded a wealth of American history and gave generously of his counsel and assistance to many of our Nation's leaders.

In 1917, when I came to Washington as secretary to the late Senator John B. Kendrick, of Wyoming, I first became acquainted with Mr. Murphy, and he was most helpful to me in my new duties. He was a good friend of Wyoming's senior Senator Francis E. Warren, and soon Senator Kendrick, as well as his secretary, also came to regard him as a valued friend. Mr. Murphy's and my friendship strengthened down through the years, with the result that the loss I feel today at his death is personal and deep. I shall miss this scholarly gentleman, this great American, during the remainder of my days.

To the members of Mr. Murphy's family I extend my most sincere sympathy. They may be comforted by the realization that he served his country well and that his memory will live long and honorably in the hearts and minds

of countless men and women who considered him their friend.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

SERVING OF OLEOMARGARINE OR MARGARINE IN NAVY RATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2168) to amend the Navy ration statute so as to provide for the serving of oleomargarine or margarine.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the bill which is the pending business merely amends the Navy's ration statute to insert the words "margarine" or "oleomargarine." It gives the Navy permissive authority to use margarine for table use, which authority is not now explicit in the statute.

The Navy Department itself for some time has indicated it wanted this authority. In many cases it is not possible to secure butter and margarine can be used with no loss of nutrition and at less cost.

As I said at the time of the introduction of this bill:

There is no valid reason why the Navy or any other branch of the armed services should not be given simple freedom of choice to buy what foods it wants or that necessity requires it to use, within the structure of the present ration statute. The omission of margarine from the ration statute is a simple discrimination against a perfectly good pure food product made from American farm products.

The bill S. 2168 is only permissive. It does not require the Navy to buy anything.

The bill limits this permissive authority by section 2, which provides that, except where the Secretary of Agriculture finds and certifies that there is a surplus of either soybean oil or cottonseed oil, margarine may not be used by the Navy for table use if surplus butter stocks are available to the Navy through the Commodity Credit Corporation.

It is apparent, therefore, that this bill is in no sense a restriction of or injury to the dairy or butter industries. It goes far to protect surplus butter's disposition channel in the armed services. It puts both butterfat and vegetable oils on the same level of treatment, insofar as those commodities may be in surplus.

I am now informed that there is no uncommitted stock of surplus butter. The great majority of CCC butter goes into the school lunch program.

S. 2168 is, therefore, a bill that seeks to remove a discrimination and to put two American farm products on the same basis in respect to use in Navy messes. I urge the Senate to approve this bill.

THE COMMUNIST INFILTRATION IN THE NUCLEAR TEST BAN MOVEMENT

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, in his statement of January 22, J. Edgar Hoover warned that Nikita Khrushchev's

1960

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

10233

the view, in this respect, which I think was very well stated, by Chancellor Adenauer who told me while visiting my house a few weeks ago, that Mr. Khrushchev without question—being a dedicated Communist—wanted communism to rule the world; that this was his objective and would continue to be his objective regardless of the means or the shifts in policy which he might adopt. But on the other hand, as Chancellor Adenauer put it very graphically, Mr. Khrushchev does not want to rule a world of ruined cities and dead bodies. And he knows, as we know, the terribly destructive force of atomic weapons; he knows, as we know, what a war would do to the countries which he may want to rule and what it might also do to his own country. And there is another argument Mr. Khrushchev might have in this respect: He firmly believes, I think, based on the conversations I've had with him—as well as other statements he has made—that he can gain his objective of domination of the world more effectively and more surely at less cost without war.

This brings us, then, to the key problem of the future. In the massive 2½-hour press conference that Mr. Khrushchev held in Paris today, I think that the most significant line in it was one that perhaps will go unnoticed in most areas of the reporting of that conference, or relatively unnoticed. It was this: Referring to this whole problem of elections in the United States, he said, well, if the next President doesn't take the right line, we'll wait for the next President and the next one after that. Then he said this significant thing: "Because we can afford to wait, we can afford to wait."

There is nothing that I think is more typical of the Communist attitude and the Communist line, and more a challenge to us, than what Mr. Khrushchev says in this respect. The Communist has a sense of history. He thinks in terms of not 5 years, but of a century, or 2 centuries if necessary; and he is willing to wait. He believes that he and his cause have the stamina and the strength to outlast the decadent societies of the West among which we, of course, are classified. So this is the challenge to us. Do we have the stamina, do we have the strength, do we have the determination in this nonmilitary struggle, which is going on now and which will continue to go in the years ahead: One, to resist further Communist gains; and two, to win the uncommitted areas of the world, who hold the balance of the power, to the side of freedom and away from those who would win it for communism. This is the key question of the next 10 years of the sixties and even beyond my day. I'd like to direct my remarks just briefly to this question in the time that remains tonight.

Let us look at this area. A billion people live in Asia, in Africa—a billion people who are unlike in many respects, but who are alike in that most of them are desperately poor and all of them need economic progress. Prime Minister Nehru put it very graphically to me when he said that the per capita income in India is one-twentieth of what it is in the poorest State in the United States.

You have never seen poverty until you have seen it in Asia and in parts of Africa, as I have seen it and my wife has seen it. You can see why the leaders of these countries say, "We must have progress." And so the question is, How are they going to get it? Which way are they going to turn? Some say, "Well, will they take progress without freedom?" The answer is that they would prefer not, and this is one of the main cards we have in our hands. Believe me, the leaders of these countries in Asia and of the newly developing countries in Africa, despite what you may hear to the contrary, want to be on our side. They prefer to have their progress and retain their independence and

retain an opportunity to develop free institutions—not like ours, because they need different institutions since they have different types of development that we have, but institutions which at least give them the right of self-determination. But make no mistake about it: If the terrible choice left to these people is progress without freedom or staying where they are, they will take progress without freedom.

The Communists tell them, "Come our way." They don't tell them, of course, that the cost is freedom, but these people know that the cost is freedom. But the Communists say, "Look at what we've done in the Soviet Union, look at what we're doing in China; come our way, for this is the way to progress for the teeming millions who do not now have an adequate standard of living." There must be an alternative in which it can be shown that there is a way to have progress without giving up freedom; unless there is that alternative, the battle for the world will be lost in this area just as surely as if a war were fought in which we were the loser as well as civilization itself.

That brings me to a very unpopular subject. There now is a bill before the Congress for appropriations for the Mutual Security Act. Part of it goes for the purpose of maintaining adequate defenses abroad. Part of it goes also for technical assistance, for loans, for other programs designed to see to it that the people in these uncommitted countries that I have mentioned, who hold the balance of power in the world, are not faced with this terrible alternative of going the Communist way or staying where they are. Yet this is a bill which has no constituents at home; this is the one that is damned always as a give-away; this is the one where people say, "Cut it down and spend it here in the United States." Particularly at this time, when in my opinion there is no question but that Mr. Khrushchev will step up his activities in the nonmilitary aspects of the world struggle, the United States should support adequate programs in the mutual security area and particularly in the technical and economic aid areas of the program provided by this bill.

I could say many things that would be much more palatable to you, but this needs to be said and that is why I wanted to say it at this point.

One other point I would like to develop in that connection. In the years ahead, we will have to maintain adequate military strength so that we are never in an unfavorable position or an unequal position at the bargaining table. We also must maintain our mutual security programs, as I have pointed out, and we must maintain our programs of economic assistance abroad. Now, this means that the United States must have an economy which is strong, and sound, and productive. There is another point about the economy which, I think, should be made before this audience.

Mr. Khrushchev, in selling his wares around the world, constantly says: Ours is the way to the greater progress. He says, we are moving faster than the United States; the American economy used to be a pretty good one, but it isn't as good as it once was and, therefore, ours is the way of the future. I think he put it best, perhaps, with one of his very clever analogies, when he was speaking in India a few months ago. You may have read what he said. He likened this competition between the American economy and the Soviet economy, to a horse race. And in referring to the American economy, he said: "There was a horse, but now it's old and tired and limping, whereas our Socialist steed is young and vigorous and vital and moving faster; we will soon pass it by and it will never catch up." Is he right? My answer is, he is wrong, but only provided we stay on our horse and don't try to get on his, as far as the economic system is concerned.

We hear a great deal about growth these days in this country. How are we going to have adequate growth, they say, how is our economy going to grow fast enough? There are those, some very well intentioned, who say: The way to growth in the United States is to increase the size of Government and to spend more in Government, and that spending by Government of and by itself is a way to make the economy of the United States grow at a fixed level which the Government can set.

Let's understand exactly what we're talking about here. Government has some real responsibilities for spending—in the military area, in the national security area, in the economic-assistance area to which I referred in the area of space, and in the necessary areas at home with which we are all familiar. But let us never forget that in our system Government should spend only what it needs to spend, and that Government spending should never be an end in itself. Or if I can put it another way: If we are going to have maximum growth of the American economy, that will keep us ahead of the Soviet Union as we are ahead of it today, the way to get that maximum growth is not to increase the size of Government or to increase Government spending; rather, the way to achieve this growth is to expand the opportunity for creative action for millions of individual Americans in the private enterprise system.

If we bear that lesson in mind in these years and months ahead, I am confident that we will win this struggle. We will be betting on the right horse, a horse that has served us well, and one that can continue to serve us well if we give it a chance, the chance that it can and should have.

Now, if I can bring one final thought to you, which is perhaps as important as anything I have said, if anything has been important in your minds up to this point, I've been speaking about our military strength, about our economic strength, about the battle for the uncommitted nations and the prospect ahead. I believe all of these are highly important parts of this struggle in which we are engaged. But they are not all of that struggle. There is another part which is even more significant and one which I can best illustrate by an example.

People have often asked, Why did the President get the magnificent reception he did in Asia and in South America? Part of the reason certainly is because he is a world-famous man and people in that part of the world—as here—like to see world-famous people. But it could not all be ascribed to that; certainly, part of it also was because of the country he represented. To prove the point, may I tell you how my wife and I had a reception which could not have been due to the fact that the people were trying to receive a world-famous man—nor his wife—but which, nevertheless, was the most moving experience of our life.

It occurred after our visit to Russia last year. We went to Poland on a Sunday afternoon from Moscow. The Polish Government, before we arrived, had tried apparently to discourage any crowds in the streets by not printing our route into the city and not indicating the time of arrival; but the word some way had gotten around. After the plane landed, we drove from the airport; as we went through the suburbs of Warsaw into the city, increasingly large groups of people came to gather on the streets, and they were singing, they were throwing bouquets of flowers onto our cars. When we got into the heart of the city—and understand, no notice by the Government, no attempt to get a crowd out—when we got into the heart of the city, a quarter of a million people were there, stopping the caravan eight times so that we had to move them out in order to move on. And when the caravan stopped, we were able to look into their faces, and they were singing and

MAY 25 1960

10228

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 25

after hearing the feasibility of the lower age for social security retirement, those opponents could see their way clear to join me in the urging of a reduced age limitation to 62.

Columnist Walter Lippmann wrote recently:

The central issue of the world struggle is whether the Soviet system or a liberal system can deal best with the problems that beset mankind. In that struggle we shall surely lose if we tell the world that, though we have the richest economy in all history, our liberal system is such that we cannot afford a sure defense and adequate provision for the civil needs of our people.

It is in this spirit that I urge revision of our social security system. A voluntary retirement age of 60 for both men and women is amply justified. Half a loaf is better than no loaf at all, however. A proper step toward this goal would be to lower the age for men to 62, so to equal the retirement age for women, and pay full benefits at 62 to both.

THE SUMMIT CONFERENCE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, somewhere in the Book of Books, there is the statement that "a little child shall lead them." It was my privilege yesterday to speak to a group of more than 42 children from a high school in, as I recall, Oshkosh, Wis. Then I submitted myself to questioning.

One of the questions was related to the recent U-2 plan incident and went something like this: "Senator, if we have agreed not to continue the exploratory missions with our U-2, how are we going to know what is going on inside Russia?" That question was asked before Midas was thrown into space—our recent wonderful demonstration that we are not behind, but that we are ahead, of the Kremlin. So perhaps that is the answer. But I could not answer the question except to say that in this age of exploration, we will find the answer or we will continue the U-2 exploratory plane missions. To me, that makes commonsense.

But the little child had the answer, because what are we going to do if we do not know what is going on back of the Iron Curtain? My mail indicates clearly that that attitude exemplifies the attitude of a good many people. They realize we have got to be on our toes, that we cannot fall asleep, that as I have said many times, we have got to be adequate, that we cannot put ourselves in the position of running the risk of another Pearl Harbor. So that little child had the wisdom that some grownups do not have.

Tomorrow, or on Friday, as everyone knows, we expect to have the Secretary of State before the Foreign Relations Committee, and, of course, a great many questions will be asked him. Some of the questions were submitted on the floor of the Senate by the Senator from Ohio yesterday. Let me say that practically all of the questions have been answered. The people know the answers now, because of the discussions over the radio and over television. As a matter of fact, one of our great American reporters, whom I heard last night, intimated that the people in Europe are not a bit upset,

that they understand the situation. We want to know what the Kremlin is up to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. WILEY. I ask for 3 more minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILEY. They recognize the situation. They recognize also that spying has been going on from early days, and that there is a difference when one goes into a country in uniform, goes into that country armed, as a spy, and when a photographer, with the U-2 instrument, covers the space about which he wants to know what is going on. In other words, because we could not get behind the Iron Curtain, we had to go over it. When we got over it, we got, as many of us know, excellent pictures of what the Kremlin has built up.

One of the questions that has been asked is, "What was the underlying cause of Mr. Khrushchev's action in Paris?"

Fundamentally, I believe there were a number of factors, including:

The Soviet Premier did not want a conference, because it was evident that the allies, standing shoulder to shoulder, were not going to make concessions to the demands of the Communists.

Mr. Khrushchev, too, has troubles at home, economic and military, with the proposed reduction of armed forces, as well as political unrest.

Mao Tse-tung, opposing the relatively conciliatory line adopted by Khrushchev, needed him for a tougher policy.

The Kremlin, I frankly believe, was afraid of the tremendous impact which Mr. Eisenhower's visit would have upon the Soviet people. After all, Ike has demonstrated his salesmanship over a great deal of this earth. The people know he speaks with conviction and that he speaks honestly. The people have faith in him. Khrushchev was afraid of the impact of his visit, there is no question about it.

One of the things I was particularly interested in was what was stated by this Russian youngster of 28 or 29 years of age, who recently left the Kremlin's espionage force. He said:

You know, there is a new generation of us youngsters in Russia. We are not satisfied with our standard of living. We are not satisfied with our voice in the government. We want something more to say.

That all intimated to me, at least, that Khrushchev is not having such an easy time.

Mr. President, all added up—they called for Khrushchev's grabbing at straws, in this case, the U-2 incident—to call off Soviet participation in a conference that would not give them what they were expected to demand.

Is there any known explanation of Khrushchev's personal attacks on President Eisenhower?

While it is only speculative, it seems reasonable to deduce that the pressures on Khrushchev were so great that he found himself in a position not only of denouncing U.S. policy, but because of previous past, relatively friendly relations with the U.S. President, now found it necessary to denounce him personally.

If there had been no U-2 incident, would the conference have been held?

From all evidence available, it appears that if Khrushchev had not used the U-2 flight as an excuse, he would have found another reason for refusing to hold the conference.

What was the significance of Malinovsky's attendance at the conference?

The presence of the general—looking over Khrushchev's shoulder—may well indicate a stronger voice of the military in Soviet affairs. In the past, military chaperons have proved far more ominous than just a traveling companion for leaders of communism.

What is the situation now inside Russia as a result of the blowup of the conference?

For the Communists, the hard core of Stalinists apparently have won a point. For the general population, however, all evidence points toward a great uneasiness—including fear of war from the blowup of the conference. A major objective of the U.S. policy now must be aimed toward stemming this uneasiness—insofar as possible—and separating the acts of the Communist leader—a 4-690 minority in the Soviet Union—from the people.

What was the reason for the U-2 flight behind the Iron Curtain?

The answer is simple. We were gathering information to prevent a sneak attack upon ourselves or any other countries of the world which are targets of Communist aggression. Until now, there has not, unfortunately, been developed any ways of obtaining information in specific detail, on activities behind the Iron, as well as the Bamboo Curtains, to provide us with the knowledge necessary to be aware of any buildup that might result in a sneak attack.

The overflights provided us with this information. They were not military attacks. The planes were not armed. The flight was an integral part of our policy of self-preservation.

If the Soviets were willing to adopt any realistic international agreements to prevent the possibility of armed aggression or sneak attack, these would not be necessary; or, if they were willing to agree to the open skies proposal as recommended by President Eisenhower, the flight would not have proved an incident at all.

We recognize, of course, that the whole field of airspace law still is relatively unexplored. The nations of the world have their job cut out for them to more clearly define national interests and boundaries in air and space.

Now, why were there seemingly contradictory statements about the U-2 flight?

Following the takeoff of the plane, it became known that the plane was not on schedule. However, there was no way of telling what had happened to it, or whether the Soviet claims of knocking it down were correct. Until this could be established by adequate evidence, there seemed some question as to whether or not it would be realistic to state that the plane had been involved in an overflight over the Soviet Union.

1960

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

10227

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in January 1960, the Social Security Administration finished 20 years of paying monthly benefits. Checks were mailed to 13¼ million men, women, and children in communities throughout the country. Since January 1940, when the first Social Security checks were received, 21 million beneficiaries have received benefits totaling \$50.4 billion. Retired workers and their dependents have received \$38.1 billion of this amount. The survivors of workers who have died received \$11.6 billion. Since July 1957, about \$750 million has been paid to eligible disabled workers and their dependents. In addition to these monthly benefits, lump-sum death payments of \$1.2 billion have been paid.

There should be pride that our social security plan, which began as a system covering only workers in commerce and industry, has won expansion, so that today practically all Americans who are earning a living are covered.

Presently, only 15.1 million persons in America's labor force are not under the Social Security system. This is out of a work force made up of 70.7 million in the United States. A breakdown of those not covered is as follows: 4.5 million are Federal, State, and local government employees; 4.1 million are unemployed; agricultural workers total 1.3 million; 1.3 million are unpaid family workers; 1 million are retired railroad workers; 0.9 million domestic workers are not covered; and miscellaneous workers total 2 million.

Liberalizations began in the 1939 amendments, when Congress recognized family need and provided benefits to dependents and survivors, as well as to the family breadwinners. Amendments extended coverage and increased benefits in 1950. In 1956, amendments provided benefits for people aged 50 and over who were so severely disabled that they could not work again.

There were other 1956 improvements, which I shall mention in a moment.

In West Virginia the effect of these programs has been dramatically illustrated. In 1950, only 46,253 persons received social security checks. By February 1959, the number totaled 189,399—almost four times the 1950 total. In 1950, monthly payments in West Virginia amounted to \$294,000 per month. In 1959, the figure stood at \$8,836,729 a month. This money means a great deal not only to the recipients, but also to the communities in which they live.

I would be the last to say, however, that the present system is perfect. For this reason, I urge lowering the eligible retirement age to 62 for men, to be the same as for women. Both should, also, receive full benefits.

The 1956 amendments provided full benefits for widows at the age of 62, and wives and women workers were given the option of accepting actuarially reduced benefits at age 62 or waiting for full benefits at age 65. I am one who has long been an advocate of a lower and more realistic retirement age for our social security program. I supported

this change in 1956, even though I did not believe then, as I do not believe now, that it went far enough.

A recent collective report by the National Planning Association, entitled "Automation: Its Impact on Business and Labor," suggests some of the new job displacement problems which are already taking place and which will be multiplied in the future. The older worker is the target of such changes.

This report points out that many people fear that labor will suffer serious dislocation and hardship resulting from automation. They express deep concern that over the next 5 to 10 years, when the great changes from automation will become accentuated, there will be a growing surplus of jobseekers.

Automation has already produced graphic effects in my State. In 1950, West Virginia had 117,000 men employed in the coal fields. Today, a decade later, there are less than 40,000 men employed in West Virginia coal mines, and just as much, or more, coal can be produced.

West Virginia is not the only State so affected by automation. All States have their problems. It has been estimated that 164 engine blocks run through the production line in an hour, at the Ford plant in Cleveland, Ohio, requiring only 41 workers on the line—a production which, under the old methods, required 117 men. The Wall Street Journal reported recently that the Raytheon Manufacturing Co.'s Television and Radio Division plant is able to produce 1,000 radios a day, with just 2 workers on the line. To maintain that production rate, standard hand assembly requires a labor force of 200 men. A new machine, called Autofab, can assemble in a little over a minute the same number of multiple-part electronic units that one worker, using conventional machinery, could do in a full day. It requires only two workers and a supervisor, and has a capacity of more than 200,000 assemblies a month, operating 40 hours a week.

I submit that we must, as one very important step in meeting the problems which automation is already creating, recognize that providing a lower retirement age under our social security system is absolutely essential.

Congress must fact up to the challenge so clearly outlined for us in the report of the National Planning Association to which I have already referred. For, in the words of this report, workers—and especially older workers—displaced by automation will not automatically fit into those new jobs which will be created because—

Unskilled workers, workers with specialized skills whose jobs have been taken over by machines, and older workers who have spent a working lifetime in a job only to find their skills made obsolete overnight, all have to be retrained so that they have a chance to acquire the new skills they need to work in an automated factory or office. Older workers, skilled or unskilled, present a particular problem. It is not easy for them to learn a new skill or, since employees are notably reluctant to hire them, to find a new job.

Summarizing its findings and their implications for the future, the report

points to a lower retirement age as one of the adjustments which must be made:

The effect of automation is to increase productivity, with the result that the problem of a dynamic balance between the number of jobseekers and the number of available jobs is very precarious. The solution is less work for each person, so that there is something for everybody to do. This can be achieved through the shorter workweek, through a lower retirement age, and through a raising of the age at which people enter the labor force. The balance can also be maintained by limiting the speed at which automation is introduced. If none of these steps is taken—or, if they are not all taken—the result will be mass unemployment, depression, and human suffering.

In the face of these facts, Mr. President, it is my conviction that we should take immediate steps to lower the retirement age in our social security plan from age 65 to age 62 for men, as is the case for women.

Opponents of any reduction in the retirement age maintain that such a move would be too expensive. Certainly it would cost more than the present program, but how much does it cost the Government when X number of workers are without jobs? Would not the reduced cost of public welfare and unemployment compensation programs go a long way toward equalizing the increased cost of lowering the age for retirement?

The Social Security Administration provided figures recently which indicate the cost to the employer, the employee, and the self-employed were the eligibility are reduced to 62 for men, with just men receiving full benefits.

The figures are based on the long-term or level-premium cost. For the employer and employee combined, the cost would be a fraction more than two-fifths of 1 percent of payroll—more easily understood, approximately \$1.4 billion per year. The self-employed would be required to contribute a little less than one-third of 1 percent of the payroll. Approximately 1.5 million male workers would be affected immediately.

More feasible would be the plan, as I have stressed, for both men and women to receive full benefits at age 62. The cost here would, of course, be correspondingly higher. Still working with the level premium cost, the employee and employer would each pay approximately two-fifths of 1 percent of the payroll, the self-employed would pay about three-fifths of 1 percent of the payroll. The total cost of the program on an annual basis would be about \$2½ billion, with some 2 million workers becoming eligible for retirement.

Theoretically, if each person eligible for retirement were to take advantage of the lowering of the age limit to 62, at least half of those 4 million Americans now unemployed would certainly have a better chance for a job.

Many of those eligible for retirement at age 62 would not retire, but it is conceivable that thousands—perhaps over a million—jobs would be made available.

For years I have advocated the lowering of the retirement age from 65 to 60. Opposition is strong to this. Perhaps,

PICTURE OF A BOMB

One of the few reports ever published about the neutron bomb—in the Washington Post, on July 19, 1959—gives you an idea of how effective one version would be:

"To obtain the maximum range, the bomb would be exploded high enough to reach its intended victims without going through structures, trees, hills, or other barriers which might slow down the neutrons."

The neutrons would travel with enough force, however, said this article, "to go through the walls of buildings and military tanks."

The bomb would deliver "a lethal dose of radiation to a distance of 1 mile—about the range of the 20-kiloton Hiroshima and Nagasaki bombs—yet produce far less damage and only about one-one thousandth of the total fallout."

Fallout in today's bombs is created when radioactive debris and dust are carried away from the immediate target area by the blast. Sometimes this "hot" debris is sucked up by winds that carry the fallout where it was not intended to go.

In the neutron bomb, only a small fission-type explosion would be needed as a trigger. This would create correspondingly less blast and fallout.

Now there is talk that TNT or another ordinary explosive could be used to set off a neutron bomb. If so, this would create a weapon with so little blast that not even the familiar atomic mushroom would appear.

ON THE BATTLEFIELD

Of what use is all this, anyway? some civilian scientists ask, when there already is enough destructive power in the world?

Such a weapon, according to one authority, could be used to great advantage tactically on a battlefield where two armies faced each other. It could be used to knock out an enemy division without contaminating friendly forces. The bomb would maim or annihilate enemy soldiers who have invaded friendly soil without destroying the industry or homes of allies.

That advantage works both ways, this authority points out: "The reason we think this principle is so important to the Russians is that any country that wants to conquer Europe and keep the production means of Europe intact must employ this kind of weapon."

"The Russians, with neutron bombs, could reduce the population of the Ruhr in a war, and move right in and keep the factories producing by using imported slave labor or military work battalions. Because there would be so little fallout, the area would be inhabitable almost immediately."

IF RUSSIA HAD IT

The danger of a neutron bomb in the hands of Russia alone is understood by U.S. Government officials, say civilian experts, although these officials are being told not to discuss the subject.

Despite the secrecy—and even some denials of U.S. interest in the project—it has been established that research is going ahead.

Work on the neutron bomb theory in this country is said to be centered at the University of California's Radiation Laboratory at Livermore, where advanced weapons are developed for the Atomic Energy Commission. It was at this laboratory that the hydrogen bomb was perfected.

Livermore scientists consider the challenge of the neutron bomb in many ways to be more demanding than the hydrogen bomb.

In today's bombs, neutrons that are released are slowed down and "captured" in the bomb-blast process before they get very far and do much damage. A practical way must be found at Livermore to enable more neutrons to "escape" more easily and penetrate great distances with great speed.

The neutron bomb is more than a scientific problem, scientists say. It involves the whole

cold-war picture. Against that background you are told this by non-Government scientists who know the story—

The big reason why scientists from the Livermore Laboratory, such as Dr. Edward Teller, its director, have been outspoken against a test-ban agreement with the Soviets is that they are worried about the neutron bomb and other atomic developments just ahead.

How, they ask, can you ever enforce a test ban?

It also explains why Dr. Teller and others who know the facts have said this Nation should resume underground testing of nuclear weapons at the first possible moment.

They say this Nation has no time to waste.

HOW FAR AHEAD?

Much work is said to remain before the neutron bomb is perfected.

Scientists see the Russians as moving ahead with research and possibly even with secret tests of the components of a neutron bomb. There is no way, under the "moratorium" supposedly now in effect, to detect what the Russians may be doing.

All this information, now in the hands of a growing number of U.S. Government, military and scientific officials, accounts in large part for increasing opposition in this country to a test-ban agreement of any kind with the Russians.

CONTROVERSY OVER NUCLEAR TESTING

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on May 13, the New York Times published a letter from Dr. John Kenneth Galbraith which stated the argument that the risks of continued nuclear testing were greater than the risks of secret Russian violations of the test ban.

On May 19, the Times published a letter of mine in reply to Professor Galbraith. I believe that these two letters provide a brief summary of the important points put forward by each side of the controversy over nuclear testing, and I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that the texts of these letters be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, May 13, 1960]

HALTING ATOMIC TESTS—CHOICE OF LEAST

PERILOUS COURSE BELIEVED TO BE NECESSARY

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The recent hearings before the Joint Commission on Atomic Energy, like much earlier discussion, suggest the presence of a strikingly unrealistic attitude toward an agreement on halting atomic tests. I do not suggest that this attitude is universal, but it does seem sufficiently common to merit comment.

We must surely agree that our task is not to eliminate all risk from our lives—that is an impossible goal—but to find the course of policy that minimizes risk. This requires that we balance the dangers of different courses of action. In the present instance there is, on the one hand, the danger of illicit violation of any agreement to ban tests and that the violation will go undetected. On the other hand, there is the danger of continued explosions. We must choose the course which involves the least peril.

Almost everyone must agree—and most do agree—that the dangers inherent in continuing the tests are virtually total. The tempo of competitive development and testing will increase. The countries newly possessed of atomic weapons will claim their right to poison their just share of the at-

mosphere. Obviously those who are making tests themselves cannot deny them the privilege. All of these dangers are predictable and certain in the absence of agreement.

POSSIBLE BAD FAITH

Against this, as noted, we must reckon with the possibility of Soviet bad faith and that it will escape detection. Some of our estimate of the danger of bad faith, we must agree, will be the residue of the bad feeling of recent years. And bad faith that involves risk of discovery is not without disadvantage as a practical policy.

But it is not my purpose to argue that this course is riskless. Rather, what is clear is that whatever its dangers, they must be less than the dangers of the first course, which are certain and total. Yet this is not the nature of much of the present calculation. It holds that the danger of violation must be totally eliminated or we will continue the tests. One is reminded of the man who insists on suicide unless he is fully protected against automobile accidents. Surely we are more logical than that.

Nor is it reassuring that many who advise against accepting the lesser risk believe that any test ban makes poor military sense. We have recently heard that our military security requires a new series of tests this summer or autumn. And a high official of the Defense Department has recently stressed the need to develop atomic weapons which, though they burn, blind, disintegrate, mutilate, and otherwise commit to a disenchanting death, are nonetheless clean.

CONCEALED POSITION

The danger of illicit violation has thus become part of the case against the agreement as such. It has no part of this case. If we believe an agreement is unwise, we should say so. This position should not be concealed behind arguments over enforceability. We fool no one with such transparent devices.

But I have difficulty in imagining that responsible military opinion can face with equanimity a world of uncontrolled tests. In the annals of armies there have always been examples of excessive and myopic preoccupation with military goals. Yet thoughtful military leaders certainly agree that the purpose of the armed services is to protect the continuing life and civilization of the community. Armed services are but one means to this end and diplomacy and diplomatic agreements are among the others.

It is to see the problem whole that we have civilian control of the Armed Forces. This will on occasion require the overruling of too parochial a military view. The danger lies not in doing so, but in failing to do so.

JOHN KENNETH GALBRAITH.

[From the New York Times, May 19, 1960]

RISKS IN BANNING TESTS—JEOPARDY TO FREE

WORLD FEARED IF CONCESSIONS ARE GRANTED

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Prof. Kenneth Galbraith's letter published May 13 argues that in choosing between the test ban and continued testing we must choose the course which involves the least peril. With this general proposition no one can find any fault. The only trouble is that he failed to specify what kind of test ban he had in mind.

Is it to be a total ban based on an enforceable system of inspection that offers some reasonable chance—let us say a one-in-ten chance—of detecting and verifying sneak tests? Or is it to be a total ban without inspection, in which we would have to rest the security of the free world on nothing more substantial than the Kremlin's word of honor? Obviously, it makes a big difference. I do not see how the comparative risks can intelligently be assessed unless you first know what you are comparing.

1960

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

10229

Could Governor Stevenson's actions have influenced Mr. Khrushchev's decision to "find an excuse" to postpone the summit conference?

From all indications, from statements made recently by the Governor, the situation is as follows: If the Democratic Party won the presidency in 1960, Governor Stevenson, if not President, would, from all indications, occupy a high place—perhaps Secretary of State—in Government.

From Mr. Stevenson's recent statements, it would certainly be reasonable to deduce that if there were a Democratic victory, the Russians might have a better chance to get what they wanted from the summit conference.

I am not, of course, inclined to say that the Democratic Party, in any way, is "soft on communism"; at the same time, Mr. Stevenson's statements indicate that if he had a voice in things, he would be far more likely to make concessions to the Soviets.

For example, I cite the translation of the article by Special Correspondent, Robert Boulay, which, though Mr. Stevenson says it "suffers from misinterpretation, or mistranslation," was published in the Paris newspaper, "Paris-Presse-l'Intransigent," as follows:

Question. What, according to you, Mr. Stevenson, is the most important question in the political world today?

Answer. The suspension of atomic tests—this is a prime question.

Question. Can it be achieved?

Answer. It must be possible to reach agreement through mutual concessions.

Question. I take it that you refer to agreement with precise control—inspection?

Up till now the Russians have not accepted the minimum inspection formula proposed to them by the Western Powers.

Answer. Naturally, an agreement with inspection * * * but I repeat to you that an agreement must be possible. This problem of atomic tests must be considered as absolute priority. With mutual concessions * * *.

Question. Does this problem appear to you of such importance as to justify concessions on other matters?

Answer. Yes, certainly.

Question. Does this mean that the Western Powers should make concessions on the German problem?

Answer. Yes, certainly.

Question. On Berlin?

Answer. Yes.

I was surprised and persisted—

Question. Do you establish a connection between atomic agreement and Germany and more particularly Berlin?

Answer. There is no connection. But an atomic agreement is basic and justifies concessions on other matters. Since you mention Berlin incidentally, the present situation cannot be maintained.

WHY 11,000

Question. But the Western Powers are not the petitioners in Berlin. It is the Russians who seem to wish to force the Western Powers to leave Berlin?

Answer. Mr. Boulay, the present situation in Berlin cannot be maintained. Strategically, the presence of 11,000 American soldiers is meaningless * * *.

Question. Must I understand that you are prepared to accept a reduction of American forces in Berlin?

Answer. Yes. * * * One could have, for instance, 7,000.

Question. Why 7,000 rather than 11,500? Would you accept 5,000, or 3,000, or none at all?

Answer. Yes, but not now; later.

(I once again expressed surprise, and asked Mr. Stevenson to explain himself more fully.)

Question. Do you believe it is possible to take the political and moral risk of such a decision?

Answer. Mr. Boulay, do not be surprised. All I am telling you, I have already said and written several times.

THE NEUTRON BOMB

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, in my remarks to the Senate on May 12, 1960, I indicated that there was a distinct possibility science could produce a neutron bomb, which could obliterate life without causing serious physical damage to property. I tried to point out that the nation developing this weapon first would have a tremendous advantage in limited war, strategic bombing, and defense against missile attack, and that a resumption of underground nuclear testing was necessary if we were to develop this weapon ahead of the Soviets.

I asked the President to inform the Nation of the possibility of developing a neutron bomb so that our leaders and our people might realize the critical nature of any test ban agreement which foreclosed this development, while permitting the Soviets to work on it through clandestine tests.

Thus far there has been no official response and last week, Newsweek magazine, apparently the victim of misinformation, curtly dismissed the possibility of a neutron bomb and treated it as a figment of my imagination.

An article in this week's issue of U.S. News & World Report takes a different view. It states that United States and Russian scientists are working on the neutron bomb and quotes scientists to the effect that we have only a million to one chance of finding out whether Russia is secretly testing neutron bomb weapons.

I ask unanimous consent that this article from the May 30 issue of U.S. News & World Report be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From U.S. News & World Report, May 30, 1960]

MOST TERRIBLE BOMB OF ALL—New WEAPON Now IN SIGHT

Next—a death ray bomb?

Such a bomb is being sought here—and in Russia, too.

Once ready, it could destroy human beings by invisible streams of neutrons, leave buildings standing.

Detecting tests of this neutron bomb will be almost impossible. That's why many U.S. scientists oppose a ban on nuclear tests.

Behind closed doors in the United States and in Russia, scientists are working on a weapon that could alter the cold war. It is the neutron bomb—the bomb that no one wants to talk about.

This new weapon, when perfected, could destroy men while leaving machines and buildings undamaged.

The weapon—in one possibility being discussed—could be built as a lightweight device able to send out streams of poison radiation greater than those produced by today's big, conventional nuclear bombs.

This version would be so compact, some sources predict, that a team of soldiers could

fire neutron warheads into enemy concentrations from simple launchers. A team of saboteurs could carry a small neutron bomb into an enemy country to destroy men at essential nerve centers.

Some scientists call this the death ray weapon of the future. The blast it would create would be so negligible that buildings, trees, railroads and vehicles would remain almost intact. It would produce almost no uncontrolled fallout. Yet its radiation—the real "guts" of a nuclear bomb—would be a highly effective and invisiblecrippler or killer of human beings.

USELESS BANS

At a time when a ban on nuclear tests is in the news, it is suddenly discovered that a workable neutron bomb would make meaningless any attempt at enforcing such a test ban.

The chances of finding out whether Russia was secretly testing neutron-bomb weapons, civilian scientists say, would be a million to one because the blast signals would be so weak and disguised.

This is the real worry among scientists in this country who know all the facts about the neutron bomb. They are convinced, one of them says, that the Soviets could make a mockery of any test ban, even if both sides agreed to numerous inspection sites and listening posts.

How far both sides have advanced in their research on the neutron bomb is a closely held secret. No project in recent years is held to be more sensitive by experts in the Pentagon.

From the Soviet Union come only broad hints at interest—and progress—by Soviet scientists. But some experts have asked whether the neutron bomb is the fantastic weapon Khrushchev recently predicted for the Soviet arsenal.

NO COMMENT

What is known, in fact, about the ability to produce a neutron bomb comes mainly from civilian U.S. scientists not connected with the Government. The Atomic Energy Commission, by its rules, refuses to acknowledge that the bomb exists even in theory.

It was of this secrecy that Senator Thomas J. Dodd, Democrat, of Connecticut, complained in a speech on May 12. He said that, although such a weapon—in the hands of either the United States or Russia—might be more than 6 months from reality, the Nation is being kept in the dark about the neutron bomb.

Senator Dodd said that, despite the official secrecy, he learned this:

"Such a bomb can theoretically be produced by tailoring the energy of a fusion explosion so that, instead of heat and blast, its primary product is a burst of neutrons."

DEATH-DEALING STREAMS

The story behind the neutron bomb involves these further details:

When a nuclear bomb is exploded, it releases energy in several forms, but mainly as heat and light. Heat is what causes blast and shock and the big mushroom seen after an atomic explosion.

Another emanation from a nuclear bomb is lethal radiation, always in very small amounts in present weapons—about 3 percent of the total energy. One primary form of this radiation is streams of neutrons, the particles that are kicked loose from the core of the atom. Most of them don't travel very far—now—but, when they reach human beings, neutrons deform and destroy body cells and, in sufficient dosages, cause death. A high percentage of the Hiroshima and Nagasaki atomic victims died not from blast but from radiation.

Now it appears possible to build the kind of bomb that will cut down on the amount of blast and "hot" debris and send larger and more powerful streams of neutrons shooting out in all directions.

THE COMMUNIST INFILTRATION IN
THE NUCLEAR TEST BAN MOVE-
MENT

~~Mr. DODD.~~ Mr. President, in
his statement of January 22,
J. Edgar Hoover warned that
Nikita Khrushchev's

1960

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

10235

visit to this country had resulted in the reinvigoration of the American Communist movement and that the FBI was receiving increasing evidence of stepped-up Communist activities at many points.

Among other things, Mr. Hoover warned that non-Communist organizations dedicated to causes that command popular support could expect Communist efforts to infiltrate their ranks.

Evidence that has come into the hands of the Subcommittee on Internal Security indicates that the Communist Party has made the nuclear test ban movement the chief target of its infiltration operations. I think it important that this evidence be placed before Congress and before the public so that we may have a better understanding of the methods by which the Communists operate and of the goals they seek to achieve. I should like to detail to you some of the evidence of this infiltration, and to suggest the outline of a self-defense program for all organizations whose purposes make them particularly vulnerable to Communist infiltration.

I do not accept the thesis that if one happens to hold a position that enjoys the support of the Communist Party on any issue, one is, ipso facto, either a pro-Communist or a fellow traveler. The Communists are opposed to the poll tax: does that make all people who oppose the poll tax Communists? The Communists support the Forand bill. Does that make the many millions of Americans who have endorsed the bill Communist sympathizers? Obviously not. But on a foreign policy issue of overriding importance like the test ban, if a legitimate organization adheres to a policy which coincides with Communist policy, then it must be prepared to expect a concerted effort at infiltration by the Communist termites. The more urgent the issue, the more respectable the organization, the more illustrious the names on its letterhead, the greater the temptation from the Communist standpoint.

The Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy is headed by a group of nationally prominent citizens about whose integrity and good faith there is no question. Among them are people like Norman Cousins, of the Saturday Review, Mr. Clarence Pickett of the American Friends Service Committee, Mr. Norman Thomas, and so forth. They advocate a point of view which some of us consider unrealistic or utopian, but it is, nevertheless, a significant point of view on an issue of life and death importance. For the personal motivations of most of those associated with the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy I have the most sincere respect. The point of view they represent deserves a hearing—indeed, it must be heard.

Last Thursday evening, May 19, the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy held a rally at Madison Square Garden in New York City. Many eminent persons attended this rally. The speakers included Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Mr. Alfred Landon, Mr. Walter Reuther, Gov. G. Mennen Williams, of Michigan, and Dr. Harold Taylor, former President of Sarah Lawrence College. At this

meeting, the speakers urged that another summit meeting be convened for the purpose of attempting to arrive at an agreement banning nuclear tests.

Because I esteem the sincerity of the original founders of the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy and the sincerity of the speakers I have named, it was for me an unpleasant duty to have to notify them that the unpublicized chief organizer of the Madison Square Garden rally, Henry Alzoms, was a veteran member of the Communist Party; that there was also evidence of serious Communist infiltration at chapter level throughout the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy; that the Communist Party and its front organizations had done their utmost to promote the meeting; that the Communists provided much of the organizing machinery for the meeting because they planned to use it as a pressure instrument in support of Soviet nuclear diplomacy.

This information was confirmed by the Subcommittee on Internal Security only several days before the Madison Square Garden meeting was scheduled to take place. Because I wished to be fair to all the decent and prominent people who were associated with the meeting as sponsors or as speakers, I had some doubt about the advisability of rushing into print with my information only 48 hours in advance of the rally. Instead, I decided to communicate the information, or at least certain essential portions of it, to Mr. Norman Cousins, the chairman of the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy. Mr. Cousins came to Washington to see me and we had a long and frank discussion about the problem.

The directors of the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, it turned out, had some inkling of the existence of a Communist infiltration and were extremely unhappy about it. When the Communist affiliations of the chief organizer of the Madison Square Garden meeting were brought to Mr. Cousins' attention, he immediately suspended the organizer in question. This was 2 days before the meeting. It is my understanding that the national committee of the organization intends to take some further measures against Communist infiltrators.

If I have any criticism to make, it is that the directors of the organization have moved so slowly to confront the problem and that the measures they have taken have been inadequate. I was, for example, surprised to discover that one of the officers of the committee, Mr. Norman Thomas, had, as early as last January, expressed serious suspicion about the individual who later became organizer of the Madison Square Garden meeting—but that no action had been taken on Mr. Thomas' warning.

To me it is appalling that the Communists should be able to infiltrate and manipulate a movement founded on sincere humanitarian and pacifist motivations, and headed by so many reputable citizens. Perhaps this is a situation in which remedial legislation is indicated, a situation in which private citizens must have the assistance of Government

to cope effectively with a movement that operates by stealth and by secrecy.

In accordance with the subcommittee's mandate from the Senate, it was clear that our duty required that we do everything in our power to get at the facts. In presenting the information we have gleaned to the Senate, it is my hope that I will be able to do so in a manner that will avoid injury to the innocent and will point the way to a constructive course of action by Government and private organizations.

The test ban has for several years now been the chief objective of the Communist propaganda apparatus. Of this there is ample documentary evidence.

In his speech before the congress of the Soviet Communist Party on January 27, Nikita Khrushchev, in his most militant rhetoric, called for a permanent ban on nuclear tests.

The main political resolution adopted by the 17th congress of the Communist Party of the U.S.A. in February 1960 said:

The demand that the administration end nuclear testing and ban the H-bomb has found a widening response in community meetings, peace talks, petitions, and sermons from the pulpit.

On February 16, 1960, seven Communists foreign language newspapers took a full-page advertisement in the New York Times and called on the President—

1. To proclaim the achievement of total, universal, and controlled disarmament as the goal of National U.S. policy.
2. To restore the moratorium on the testing of nuclear weapons and to do everything in your power to insure early agreement on the banning of all nuclear tests.
3. To oppose the sharing of nuclear warheads with NATO allies.

The Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy has not solicited the praise of the Communist movement, and most of its leaders, I am certain, would be much happier if they received no plaudits from Communist sources. The fact, nevertheless, remains that the committee in recent years has been the recipient of consistent and generous praise from the Communist press. The Communist organ, New World Review, for April of this year, for example, carried these paragraphs under the caption "Peace Groups in the United States":

No amount of conspiratorial silence can wipe out the forces for disarmament and peace; but it can leave them isolated from each other and ignorant of the efforts their fellows are making.

It is our purpose to bring to our readers' attention the main groups in our country working toward these ends, beginning in this issue . . . with a description of the main nonsectarian national organization.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR A SANE NUCLEAR POLICY

SANE offers a wide choice of channels for expression of the American people's desire for a world without war. Under the co-chairmanship of Norman Cousins, editor of the Saturday Review, and Clarence Pickett, executive secretary emeritus of the American Friends Service Committee, and with the sponsorship and support of many noted Americans, SANE provides an elastic organization and comprehensive program through which ordinary people can be effective.

1960

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

10235

visit to this country had resulted in the reinvigoration of the American Communist movement and that the FBI was receiving increasing evidence of stepped-up Communist activities at many points.

Among other things, Mr. Hoover warned that non-Communist organizations dedicated to causes that command popular support could expect Communist efforts to infiltrate their ranks.

Evidence that has come into the hands of the Subcommittee on Internal Security indicates that the Communist Party has made the nuclear test ban movement the chief target of its infiltration operations. I think it important that this evidence be placed before Congress and before the public so that we may have a better understanding of the methods by which the Communists operate and of the goals they seek to achieve. I should like to detail to you some of the evidence of this infiltration, and to suggest the outline of a self-defense program for all organizations whose purposes make them particularly vulnerable to Communist infiltration.

I do not accept the thesis that if one happens to hold a position that enjoys the support of the Communist Party on any issue, one is, ipso facto, either a pro-Communist or a fellow traveler. The Communists are opposed to the poll tax: does that make all people who oppose the poll tax Communists? The Communists support the Forand bill. Does that make the many millions of Americans who have endorsed the bill Communist sympathizers? Obviously not. But on a foreign policy issue of overriding importance like the test ban, if a legitimate organization adheres to a policy which coincides with Communist policy, then it must be prepared to expect a concerted effort at infiltration by the Communist termites. The more urgent the issue, the more respectable the organization, the more illustrious the names on its letterhead, the greater the temptation from the Communist standpoint.

The Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy is headed by a group of nationally prominent citizens about whose integrity and good faith there is no question. Among them are people like Norman Cousins, of the Saturday Review, Mr. Clarence Pickett of the American Friends Service Committee, Mr. Norman Thomas, and so forth. They advocate a point of view which some of us consider unrealistic or utopian, but it is, nevertheless, a significant point of view on an issue of life and death importance. For the personal motivations of most of those associated with the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy I have the most sincere respect. The point of view they represent deserves a hearing—indeed, it must be heard.

Last Thursday evening, May 19, the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy held a rally at Madison Square Garden in New York City. Many eminent persons attended this rally. The speakers included Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Mr. Alfred Landon, Mr. Walter Reuther, Gov. G. Mennen Williams, of Michigan, and Dr. Harold Taylor, former President of Sarah Lawrence College. At this

meeting, the speakers urged that another summit meeting be convened for the purpose of attempting to arrive at an agreement banning nuclear tests.

Because I esteem the sincerity of the original founders of the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy and the sincerity of the speakers I have named, it was for me an unpleasant duty to have to notify them that the unpublicized chief organizer of the Madison Square Garden rally, Henry Alrons, was a veteran member of the Communist Party; that there was also evidence of serious Communist infiltration at chapter level throughout the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy; that the Communist Party and its front organizations had done their utmost to promote the meeting; that the Communists provided much of the organizing machinery for the meeting because they planned to use it as a pressure instrument in support of Soviet nuclear diplomacy.

This information was confirmed by the Subcommittee on Internal Security only several days before the Madison Square Garden meeting was scheduled to take place. Because I wished to be fair to all the decent and prominent people who were associated with the meeting as sponsors or as speakers, I had some doubt about the advisability of rushing into print with my information only 48 hours in advance of the rally. Instead, I decided to communicate the information, or at least certain essential portions of it, to Mr. Norman Cousins, the chairman of the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy. Mr. Cousins came to Washington to see me and we had a long and frank discussion about the problem.

The directors of the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, it turned out, had some inkling of the existence of a Communist infiltration and were extremely unhappy about it. When the Communist affiliations of the chief organizer of the Madison Square Garden meeting were brought to Mr. Cousins' attention, he immediately suspended the organizer in question. This was 2 days before the meeting. It is my understanding that the national committee of the organization intends to take some further measures against Communist infiltrators.

If I have any criticism to make, it is that the directors of the organization have moved so slowly to confront the problem and that the measures they have taken have been inadequate. I was, for example, surprised to discover that one of the officers of the committee, Mr. Norman Thomas, had as early as last January, expressed serious suspicion about the individual who later became organizer of the Madison Square Garden meeting—but that no action had been taken on Mr. Thomas' warning.

To me it is appalling that the Communists should be able to infiltrate and manipulate a movement founded on sincere humanitarian and pacifist motivations, and headed by so many reputable citizens. Perhaps this is a situation in which remedial legislation is indicated, a situation in which private citizens must have the assistance of Government

to cope effectively with a movement that operates by stealth and by secrecy.

In accordance with the subcommittee's mandate from the Senate, it was clear that our duty required that we do everything in our power to get at the facts. In presenting the information we have gleaned to the Senate, it is my hope that I will be able to do so in a manner that will avoid injury to the innocent and will point the way to a constructive course of action by Government and private organizations.

The test ban has for several years now been the chief objective of the Communist propaganda apparatus. Of this there is ample documentary evidence.

In his speech before the congress of the Soviet Communist Party on January 27, Nikita Khrushchev, in his most militant rhetoric, called for a permanent ban on nuclear tests.

The main political resolution adopted by the 17th congress of the Communist Party of the U.S.A. in February 1960 said:

The demand that the administration end nuclear testing and ban the H-bomb has found a widening response in community meetings, peace talks, petitions, and sermons from the pulpit.

On February 16, 1960, seven Communists foreign language newspapers took a full-page advertisement in the New York Times and called on the President—

1. To proclaim the achievement of total, universal, and controlled disarmament as the goal of National U.S. policy.
2. To restore the moratorium on the testing of nuclear weapons and to do everything in your power to insure early agreement on the banning of all nuclear tests.
3. To oppose the sharing of nuclear warheads with NATO allies.

The Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy has not solicited the praise of the Communist movement, and most of its leaders, I am certain, would be much happier if they received no plaudits from Communist sources. The fact, nevertheless, remains that the committee in recent years has been the recipient of consistent and generous praise from the Communist press. The Communist organ, New World Review, for April of this year, for example, carried these paragraphs under the caption "Peace Groups in the United States":

No amount of conspiratorial silence can wipe out the forces for disarmament and peace; but it can leave them isolated from each other and ignorant of the efforts their fellows are making.

It is our purpose to bring to our readers' attention the main groups in our country working toward these ends, beginning in this issue . . . with a description of the main nonsectarian national organization.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR A SANE NUCLEAR POLICY

SANE offers a wide choice of channels for expression of the American people's desire for a world without war. Under the co-chairmanship of Norman Cousins, editor of the Saturday Review, and Clarence Pickett, executive secretary emeritus of the American Friends Service Committee, and with the sponsorship and support of many noted Americans, SANE provides an elastic organization and comprehensive program through which ordinary people can be effective.

1960

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

10237

ences between the Soviet position and our own. These differences hinge around the question of inspection. In my own opinion, we have already conceded too much, especially by agreeing in principle to a further voluntary moratorium on undetectable underground tests. But for those tests that are subject to detection, we still take the stand that there should be an inspection system based on an adequate number of fixed stations, with at least 20 or 30 onsite inspections per annum. The Kremlin wants a minimum of inspection. It wants as few stations as possible, and its spokesmen have indicated that they would not be willing to accept more than a few onsite inspections per annum.

The Kremlin apparently attached major importance to the Madison Square Garden meeting as a pressure operation in support of its nuclear objectives. This, I believe, is conclusively demonstrated by the generous and sympathetic coverage of the meeting in the Soviet press. I think this is interesting. According to an AP dispatch of May 21st, Pravda headlined its account of the meeting with the words "We Want To Live in Friendship With the Soviet Union," while the Izvestia headline read "Rebuff to Advocates of War."

I believe that the heads of the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy have a serious contribution to make to the great debate on national policy. But they can only make this contribution effectively if they purge their ranks ruthlessly of Communist infiltration and if they clearly demarcate their own position from that of the Communists, first, by stressing the need for adequate inspection, second, by reiterating at every opportunity their opposition to the tyranny of communism.

On the basis of the evidence that has come to me, I do not believe that the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy has taken the necessary measures to create a climate that is inhospitable to Communist infiltration. At the Madison Square Garden rally, for example, there was much direct and inferential criticism of American policy, but, according to the press accounts and reports from private sources—persons who were present at the meeting—there was almost no criticism of Khrushchev or of his arrogant, insulting, gutter-level behavior in Paris. On the contrary, the speakers called for an immediate effort to renew the summit conference.

Let me digress briefly for a comment on this last proposal, which has, unfortunately, not been confined to the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy. Perhaps I am old-fashioned, but to me it seems that after the President of the United States has had to endure a barrage of the crudest insults ever leveled at a head of state, a petition to Khrushchev for another summit meeting would constitute a total abandonment of national dignity. The only conceivable political consequence of so craven an action would be to encourage Khrushchev to further arrogance and further demands.

As I have said, I have found no serious evidence that the Madison Square Garden meeting was organized and conducted in a manner which would have discouraged Communist participation. It was not surprising, therefore, that the Communists and their sympathizers turned out in force. Although no Gallup poll or breakdown was possible, I am convinced from reports that the Communists were responsible for a very substantial percentage of the overflow turnout. A number of well-known Communists, including Alexander Trachtenberg, a top party member, were observed in the audience. Outside the meeting, the Communists brazenly distributed literature in their own name.

If decent organizations like the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy wish to protect themselves against the danger of Communist infiltration, I cannot emphasize too strongly the need for an organizational climate that is openly inhospitable to Communists. This is a situation where a tepid declaration of devotion to democracy simply will not suffice, while a neutral silence is an open invitation to disaster.

I can think of other things that can and should be done by the directors of the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy and of other non-Communist organizations which must contend with the problem of Communist infiltration. At top level, control is relatively easy. One can more or less assume that the people who are elected to a board of directors or to a national committee have enjoyed public visibility over a period of years so that their records are known. At the local level, not even the FBI with all of its resources could offer a 100 percent guarantee against infiltration. However, I think it is possible for organizations to exercise a good deal of control by carefully examining the personal records and bona fides, first, of all those who volunteer to help establish local organizations; second, of those who are elected to office in local organizations; third, of all those assigned to organizing activities.

If any effort had been made to do these things, the Madison Square Garden situation might have been avoided. But for 25 years, Henry Abrams has been a Communist. Without looking up his record, the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy allowed him to become the chief organizer of the rally in New York City. That was not taking the necessary precautionary measures.

I think it is not too much to ask that all such committees, which are headed by good people and made up of thousands of good people, ought to give consideration to the question whether Communists like Abrams are taking a part in the running of their meetings. Many of these committees have been doing good work. But it is little wonder that they become infiltrated by Communists if they do not take the pains and the time to ascertain who some of their people are, before they allow them to become officers or chief organizers of mass rallies.

I believe it is not too much to ask our fellow citizens who are organizing committees for the purpose of exerting in-

fluence on Congress—as they have every right to do—to make a preliminary, cursory check of the persons who are working in their organizations, especially before they hold such meetings.

This would not be an easy task. But there is much that can be done. It will not always be possible to obtain accurate personal information, because many Communists operate underground as secret party members. But in the case of a man like Abrams, who has a public record of membership, the facts should be available without too much effort.

Perhaps this is a situation in which private organizations can in some way be assisted by Government. This is a problem that the Subcommittee on Internal Security is at present exploring.

Mr. President, in closing my remarks, I wish to pay my personal tribute to Mr. Norman Cousins, the chairman of the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, for the manner in which he has reacted to the revelations of the subcommittee. Mr. Cousins has been a neighbor and a friend of mine for many years. I have the highest regard for him. That is why I called him up and told him what I knew about Abrams. He was good enough to come to Washington to see me.

I said, "I don't want to release this material 24 hours before your meeting. You have your plans all made. But many innocent people will be present, and a number of them will be prominent people. Why haven't you checked on people like Abrams?" Norman Thomas said in January that he was doubtful about the man's background. Here it is the middle of May, on the eve of your meeting, and you have not yet done anything."

Mr. Cousins was upset about the matter. He immediately suspended Abrams. Not only did he do this, but he told me he was glad we had informed him about Abrams. He offered to open the books of his organization to the subcommittee and to cooperate in every way to rid his organization of Communists.

I assure Mr. Cousins and other persons connected with his committee that the Subcommittee on Internal Security is ready to cooperate with them to help to prevent a repetition of the Madison Square Garden situation.

I think it is not too much to say that the subcommittee is desirous and willing to help any other organization to avoid infiltration by subterranean elements who are not there for any good purpose, and who are certainly not interested, as are the good people who make up the bulk of their membership, in the welfare of the United States.

I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 809 OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1482, S. 3226. I may say that the bill has been cleared with the leadership on both sides of the aisle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIRE in the chair). The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3226) to amend section 809 of the National Housing Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Committee on Banking and Currency will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, in line 4, after the word "section," it is proposed to insert:

The Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, or his designee, is authorized to guarantee and indemnify the Armed Services Housing Mortgage Insurance Fund against loss to the extent required by the Commissioner, in accordance with the provisions of subsection (b) of this section, in the case of mortgages referred to in this subsection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama give a brief explanation of the bill and the amendment?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I shall be glad to do so.

Senate bill 3226 amends section 809 of the National Housing Act. Section 809 was added to the National Housing Act in 1956, pursuant to Public Law 574, 2d session, 84th Congress, to help solve the housing problems of essential civilian employees of the armed services at research and development installations. The establishment of this special program was necessary because in some instances homes built for such employees in towns near or adjacent to such installations would be above and beyond those needed for the normal economic growth of the community. In the opinion of the Federal Housing Administration, homes built in excess of those needed for normal growth of a community cannot meet the test of economic soundness required by statute as a prerequisite for FHA mortgage insurance. Section 809 permits the economic soundness test to be waived in such cases.

In order to qualify for insurance, section 809 provides that an individual is required to hold a certificate issued by the Secretary of Defense which certifies that first, the employee requires housing; second, the employee is, on the date of the certificate, a civilian employed at a research and development installation of one of the armed services of the United States; and third, the employee is considered by the armed services to be an essential, nontemporary employee on such date.

In addition, the Secretary of Defense is required to certify to the Commission-

er of the Federal Housing Administration that housing is necessary for these civilian employees and that there is no present intention to substantially curtail the number of such civilian personnel assigned or to be assigned to such installations. The latter certificate is conclusive evidence to the FHA Commissioner of the need for housing; but if the Commissioner determines that mortgage insurance on such housing is not an acceptable risk, he may require the Secretary of Defense to guarantee the armed services housing mortgage insurance fund from loss with respect to the mortgages in question.

This program has been very helpful in supplying needed housing to essential employees of the armed services in areas surrounding Cocoa and Eglin Air Force Bases, Fla.; China Lake, Calif.; and Redstone Arsenal, at Huntsville, Ala.

Administrative jurisdiction over certain research and development installations has recently been transferred from the Department of Defense to NASA. While these transfers do not alter the intent of section 809, it has been concluded by the HHFA and the NASA that the program as presently constituted is not available to essential civilian employees of NASA at installations so transferred. The reason for this conclusion is that the Administrator of NASA has no present authority to certify eligible employees, and cannot guarantee the FHA against loss.

The amendment as proposed by Senate bill 3226 is designed to overcome these technical difficulties so that essential civilian employees at installations transferred from the Department of Defense to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration may use the section 809 program to obtain needed housing.

Mr. KUCHEL. Very well, Mr. President; I am prepared to vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 3226) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 809 of the National Housing Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g) A mortgage secured by property which is intended to provide housing for a person employed or assigned to duty at a research or development installation of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and which is located at or near such installation, where such installation was a research or development installation of one of the military departments of the United States (on or after June 13, 1956) before its transfer to the jurisdiction of such Administration, may (if the mortgage otherwise meets the requirements of this section) be insured by the Commissioner under the provisions of this section. The Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, or his designee, is authorized to guarantee and indemnify the Armed Services Housing Mortgage Insurance Fund against loss to the extent required by the Commissioner, in accordance with the provisions of subsection (b) of this section, in the case of mortgages referred to in this subsection. For purposes of this subsection,

(1) the terms 'Armed Forces', 'one of the military departments of the United States', 'military department', 'Secretary or his designee', and 'Secretary' when used in subsections (a) and (b) of this section, and the term 'Secretary of the Army, Navy, or Air Force' when used in section 805, shall be deemed to refer to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration or the Administrator thereof, as may be appropriate, (2) the terms 'civilian employee', 'civilians', and 'civilian personnel' as used in this section shall be deemed to refer to employees of such Administration or a contractor thereof or to military personnel assigned to duty at an installation of such Administration, and (3) the term 'military installation' when used in section 805 shall be deemed to refer to an installation of such Administration."

SERVING OF OLEOMARGARINE OR MARGARINE IN NAVY RATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2169) to amend the Navy ration statute so as to provide for the serving of oleomargarine or margarine.

FEDERAL AIR POLLUTION LAWS NEED TO BE STRENGTHENED

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the necessity to strengthen the program under which the United States is assisting efforts to reduce air pollution becomes more obvious with the passage of time. From many quarters, there is being provided evidence that the proportions of the problem warrant removal of legislative shackles from the U.S. Public Health Service and sister agencies, which have been charged by Congress with helping clean up the atmosphere which is essential to existence.

Earlier this session, in company with my colleague from California and both colleagues from Pennsylvania, I introduced a bill, strongly recommended by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, to allow greater latitude and flexibility in Public Health Service activities in this field.

Within the past few days, more reasons for enacting such legislation have been revealed. Among them is a report to the Air Pollution Control Association, to the effect that the extent of automobile-caused smog has increased greatly in the last 5 years. This alarming information is contained in an article published in the Washington Post and Times Herald, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit I.)

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, another illustration of the need to give the Public Health Service more tools for its air pollution program is the continuing and growing demand for the promulgation of standards and the establishment of criteria to govern the discharge of pollutants into the atmosphere.

My own State of California recently, by action of its legislature, has taken steps to reduce contamination of the air by automobiles. Only this week, related

easily outmode a great deal of current thinking, and could make academic many of the disputes which now divide the world.

The immediate objective of the Midas satellite family, of course, is to provide early warning of any possible ballistic missile attack against the United States. Should the experiment now underway be successful, the time in which we would learn of such an assault would be materially increased.

Behind the Midas satellite, there is the reconnaissance satellite. This instrument—still in the future—can give us accurate information as to what is happening on the face of the globe.

It seems to me, however, that we must look upon these developments as more than merely weapons added to the military arsenal of the United States. If our vision is limited to methods of destruction, we shall not obtain the only truly worthwhile goal—a world of peace and a world of freedom.

The reconnaissance satellite, once it is in operation, will bring to a reality President Eisenhower's proposal for open skies. The issues of "overflights" and espionage will become dim echoes out of the past.

We live in a country which can flourish best in a world where secrecy and suspicion have been abolished. We have a system that can stand up under the closest scrutiny of other people seeking to find flaws in our way of life.

It is not necessary for our great country to build walls to keep people out or to shut our own people in. We can exist confident in the strength of our system which provides both freedom and prosperity to an extent never before known in history.

For this reason, it would seem to me, as I have suggested before, that it would be wise for our country to launch a crash program to develop the reconnaissance satellite. Once it is in orbit, we should offer in good faith to turn over the information that it would get to the United Nations.

A nation which is not an aggressor, but which truly desires to live in peace, has nothing to lose from such a step. It has, on the contrary, a great deal to gain.

We need a world in which people do not have to live under the haunting

shadow of fear that a devastating attack may be launched at any time against their whole land. That world can become a possibility; and it may be that our able scientists and our great technicians and our great leaders in Government in their restless and eager quest for new knowledge may put into our hands instruments that can lead to peace.

SATELLITES AND PEACE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, in light of the current world situation, the successful effort to launch an experimental Midas satellite by the Air Force could easily be one of the most significant events of the year. It could

MAY 25 1960

1960

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A4475

right to earn a decent living and provide for their families.

It prevents their full participation in the life of their country. Any worker that becomes unemployed during this period finds it impossible to get a job of any importance, or at a wage commensurate his ability and experience. It robs him under the social security program of any chance of receiving worthwhile benefits at 65 years because at least 90 percent of the covered employment is contained in industry from which he is barred.

The fruitless years between 40 and 65 that should be the golden years to which his industry and good citizenship entitled him are instead a period of no meaning, no sense of belonging, and breed discontent and disrespect for our form of government.

These age barriers are wasteful because they rob our economy of the wealth-producing potentials of a segment of our labor force whose experience has produced skills that could be of untold value. To discard these workers at the very height of their proficiency is foolish and wasteful.

They are unsound because they remove from our economy a large segment of potential consumer-customers. An employed worker is an asset to his country because he pays his own way by paying taxes. An unemployed worker produced nothing and therefore is a liability who has to be fed by the rest of us through taxes.

An employed worker creates his own job by the alchemy of money circulation.

This practice has been caused by the rigors of present-day competition and cannot be corrected by the employers themselves. It can only be corrected by governmental action.

Therefore the Fraternal Order of Eagles is asking all citizens to join with them and petition Congress to pass legislation to outlaw this unwise practice.

These petitions are now being circulated in prominent spots throughout the city. If you see one ask to sign it. If you wish to sign one and you do not see one, "Mr. and Mrs. Anacortes Citizen," contact the Eagles' Hall or one of the committee (Stan Anderson, Harley Sutt, Ray Balthazor, or Al Chonzena).

Thank you.

Secretary of Defense Gates Opens SEATO Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1960

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therewith an address delivered by the Honorable Thomas Sovereign Gates, Jr., Secretary of Defense, on Wednesday, May 25, to the opening session of the 12th Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO) Military Advisers Conference, in Washington. I had the great privilege of witnessing this historic event.

Secretary Gates' speech was a clear, concise, and dignified greeting and statement of our Government's stand against the Communist threat to world peace. With his usual and noteworthy clarity,

he told the world of the U.S. intention to honor our commitments in defense of freedom-loving peoples in this important quadrant of the world's surface. The speech follows:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE THOMAS S. GATES, JR., AT OPENING OF THE SEATO 12TH MILITARY ADVISERS CONFERENCE, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Excellencies, military advisers, delegates, ladies, and gentlemen, it is a unique honor to address this distinguished group and to open the 12th SEATO Military Advisers Conference.

On behalf of President Eisenhower, the U.S. Government, and the American people I extend to each of you a most cordial welcome.

We meet at a time when the world has been startled and shocked by the abruptness with which the hopes for the reduction of tensions from a successful summit conference have been shattered. One thing has emerged of great value to all who are devoted to freedom: a new appreciation of the solid basis on which our relationships with our allies rests. The people of this country are deeply grateful for the unity shown by the nations of the free world at this time. The bonds among us have never been stronger.

The purposes, current activities, and future tasks of SEATO constitute a vital element in maintaining stability in the course of world events. With communism seeking to destroy all that the free nations of the world are striving to build and to maintain, the stability of the free world depends on the security of each of us. SEATO is based on this concept of interdependence, and is a proud demonstration of its success.

The purposes of the SEATO collective defense to which we have mutually bound ourselves remain valid. Time moves quickly. It has been 6 years since eight free nations pledged their collective resources to maintain the peace and security of southeast Asia and southwest Pacific through common action. It is significant that the Communists have not challenged its integrity nor tested its collective strength through direct overt aggression.

During its short span of life SEATO has grown from an idea into an effective organization. National forces of the southeast Asia countries, backed by powerful mobile forces contribute to the deterrent and provide the security behind which the free peoples of the area live and develop their resources. Coordinated SEATO military plans have been prepared and are capable of rapid execution to parry any likely Communist threat.

Through military field exercises, skills have been developed and refined, operating procedures established, and command arrangements tested. SEATO exercises have progressed from simple observer type to the sophisticated maneuvers of land, sea, and air units of member nations.

The United States remains dedicated in its support of SEATO. We are prepared and will honor our commitments. Our military forces have never been more powerful. They are capable of decisive action in general war if this should be forced upon us. Together with our allies we can meet lesser military actions anywhere in the world.

While it is inspiring to note the strides already made, great tasks still face us. The military threat of communism has not declined since SEATO was born in Manila 6 years ago. Communist leaders remain dedicated to the achievement of their goal of world domination. Their tactics, as you are aware, consist of threats and blandishments, warnings, and false promises. They exploit every opportunity and apply various forms of pressure. If a government is weak, greater and increasing pressures are applied in the

hope that a revolutionary situation will develop. If a government successfully counters one particular Communist thrust, the Communist tactics change. The recent history of the southeast Asia and the southwest Pacific is replete with evidence of such Communist actions. They will may resort to military force if they believe it will be successful.

The nature of this opposition simply makes it more difficult for us to accomplish our high purpose. We can be encouraged, however, by our success to date. The collective security arrangements of the free world have deterred military aggression. The resolution of the nations of SEATO, backed by the tangible assistance rendered by the United States through its military assistance program, have achieved an effective defense.

The Secretary of State, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and I are convinced of the indispensability of military assistance as an integral part not only of our own defenses but those of the entire free world.

We are strongly supporting the program of the President. We are determined to make the maximum use of the resources which Congress makes available. Our goal is to obtain on a worldwide basis the best possible free world defense.

I have just returned from Paris. Since the world press featured the Paris events on their front pages almost continuously for 2 weeks, there is not much I can add to what you already know. In view of the happenings in Paris, I wish to quote from President Eisenhower's message to the NATO ministerial meeting in Istanbul about a month ago:

"We approach these Paris talks with a sincere desire to do all possible to reduce the tensions and dangers that now exist. Yet we cannot reasonably anticipate any quick or spectacular results. This meeting will be one more in what may prove a long succession of diplomatic exchanges dealing with some of the most difficult problems of our era. These are not susceptible to early solution. We can, at best, hope to make some modest progress toward our goals."

We did approach these talks with a sincere desire to reduce world tensions. As the developments unfolded, however, it became increasingly clear that the Soviet Union has decided well in advance to torpedo the summit. Western firmness did not back down before Khrushchev's ultimatums.

I would be remiss if I failed to note that our colleagues from Britain and France, as well as the other NATO partners, displayed a convincing unity of purpose and action in the face of Soviet divisive efforts. The Soviet conduct both in Paris and at the United Nations demonstrated that a difficult road lies ahead as we seek solutions to the most complex problems of our times.

It is too early to tell what further developments may take place. The President of the United States will continue his efforts toward peace with justice and still hopes to make, as he put it, "some modest progress towards our goals" even though the Soviet actions have increased the difficulties. In short, we still intend to seek a relaxation of tensions by all means, short of impairing our common security. We must always negotiate from strength.

We recognize that military preparedness will not by itself meet the challenges facing southeast Asia. Our multilateral efforts to promote the economic growth of the area and the material well-being of the people must be intensified. Mere survival is not enough to meet the demands of the future. Social and economic progress must be made. Mature and stable national institutions are necessary to the structure we are jointly striving to build.

Each SEATO Military Advisers Conference has cemented the ties of friendship and co-

A4476

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

May 25

operation. Conferences have developed ideas and recommendations which resulted in coordinated plans and actions. This meeting I am confident will be no exception. I take pleasure in declaring this conference open, and I wish you every success in the work before you.

Canal Block—No Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1960

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, the Congress approved an amendment to the "Statement of Policy" of the Mutual Security Act.

This amendment reaffirms America's traditional support of freedom of the seas, and our opposition to boycotts, blockades, and restrictions on the use of international waterways, conducted by nations that receive U.S. economic assistance against other beneficiaries of our aid.

The amendment created widespread interest because of its implied calls for a positive and firm U.S. policy in the Near East. In this connection, I would like to call to the attention of the Members of this body an editorial which appeared in the May 4, 1960, issue of the Statesman, Salem, Oreg.

The text of the editorial follows:

CANAL BLOCK—No Aid

The Senate on Monday passed the mutual aid authorization bill. Its ceiling was only about \$50 million under the budget request whereas the House cut was \$87 million. The final amount, however, will be determined by what is included in the appropriation bill to follow. Probably the cut will be considerably larger.

The real battle in the Senate developed over a provision to withhold aid to any country which denies free access to international waterways. This was in the bill passed by the House, but Senator FULBRIGHT, Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, offered an amendment to soften this ban. It was defeated 45 to 39.

Everyone knew that the provision was aimed at the United Arab Republic headed by Nasser of Egypt who has barred ships from using the Suez Canal if they were carrying goods to or from Israel. The prohibition has been strongly condemned, the United Nations itself calling on Egypt to open the canal for universal use. Nasser replies that Egypt is still in state of war with Israel, and so is not bound to permit passage of its commerce.

Nasser conveniently forgets that United Nations, led by the United States, pulled his chestnuts out of the fire in 1956 when Britain, France, and Israel had Egypt on the ropes in their invasion and attack on the canal. He forgets that, to induce the invaders to withdraw, Dulles gave assurances for this country respecting the opening of the canal. He forgets, too, the fast work under United Nations to clear the canal and thus renew the flow of revenues to the Egyptian treasury from the users of the canal. Nasser also rejected the intercession of Dag Hammarskjöld, Secretary General of U.N., who was commissioned to appeal for opening the canal to Israeli shipping.

If not a breach of faith, it is certainly base ingratitude toward U.N. for rescuing Nasser

and his regime from probably crushing defeat. But the Arab bitterness toward Israel bars any concession even though the Egyptian stand is quite untenable.

Nasser knows we aren't going to go to war to open the canal, so he just thumbs his nose at us. The administration favors walking softly in the Middle East. That is understandable, but it is hard to justify foreign aid when a nation is so obdurate in resisting the pressures of the United States and United Nations. Withholding aid is a mild alternative to brandishing Teddy Roosevelt's big stick. We don't need to be pushed around all the time by the small nation bidding for aid while it ignores its obligations to the international community.

Adlai Still Not Attuned to People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1960

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of representing one of the finest districts in the Midwest.

A great many people think that we who live in the interior of the country are not as interested in foreign affairs and national defense as those who reside on the seaboard. That is not a fact. We are deeply concerned about the international situation and we are well aware of our need for a strong defense prepared for any emergency.

It is important that the Congress know what the "man on the street" from the Midwest thinks. I am accordingly inserting in the Record the following editorial that appeared in the May 23 issue of the Danville Commercial-News, one of the leading newspapers in my district:

ADLAI STILL NOT ATTUNED TO PEOPLE

Adlai Stevenson again has demonstrated that he is out of touch with the man on the street. In condemning the administration for the events prior to and admittedly connected with the collapse of the summit meeting, he was—as he has been known to do in the past—talking from the top of his head.

On the face of it, his criticism does not seem out of the way, considering his position as titular head of the Democratic Party. In a republic, it is not only the privilege but the duty of the opposition party to be a watchdog for the people's interest.

But will the man on the street so interpret Stevenson's attitude? The chances are great that he will not. In the first place, the timing of the criticism was much too belated. The immediate reaction of the people to disclosure of the U-2 plane incident was indignation. There was a widespread feeling that we had goofed, that the administration had committed another blunder in a long series of diplomatic mistakes dating back through both Republican and Democratic regimes. But it soon became clear that the summit was doomed to failure under any circumstances. Legitimate or trumped up, Khrushchev would have found an excuse to torpedo the meeting.

Few Americans, regardless of party, doubt Eisenhower's sincerity of purpose. And when he and the great Nation he symbolizes as President were subjected to a vicious, guttersnipe attack, what happened?

An enormous wave of sympathy developed. A tremendous chain reaction of resentment,

hot as nuclear fission, built up against the Soviet Union. Our President was being pushed around by a loud-mouthed, arrogant bully. Hence, America was being pushed around. Americans don't like to be pushed around. They don't like to see other Americans pushed around.

Stevenson finds fault with the President for not lying when Khrushchev "gave (him) an out by suggesting that he was not responsible." Is this sort of astonishing faultfinding likely to endear Stevenson, or the party which he represents, with the man on the street?

To be sure, many Democrats in high places disavow any part of such criticism. They rightly resent Khrushchev's intimation that he could deal with an administration of their party. But what does Stevenson mean when he says that successful negotiation with the Soviet is impossible with the GOP in power? Successful for whom? Does he suggest that if he were President—or Secretary of State for KENNEDY—that he could establish an entente cordiale with the Kremlin?

The man on the street is likely to feel that a Khrushchev happy with the American Government is a Khrushchev who, to paraphrase a popular song, has the whole world under his pudgy thumb.

The Democrats certainly must bear a major share of the blame for the ineptitude of our bipartisan dealings with Russia over the years. It is a little late in the day for a Foreign Relations Committee probe to fix blame for the spy plane incident. The roots, if the investigation were fair and complete, would extend back at least to 1933.

But the responsible Democratic leaders, motivated both by their American patriotism and the realities of practical politics, cannot help but be chagrined by evidence that Adlai Stevenson still hasn't learned how to get through to the man who counts most: The man on the street.

Memorial Day 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, within a few days Americans everywhere will observe Memorial Day.

In keeping with the occasion the following statement appeared in my Washington Newsletter May 28 in lieu of my usual report on legislative activities:

MEMORIAL DAY 1960

Memorial Day is distinctly an American institution—a deeply significant sentimental custom established by our American people more than 90 years ago. It is not only observed in every community across our Nation but in many foreign lands and across the high seas.

What the American people do in their local communities on Memorial Day is actually symbolic of our contribution to the overall Memorial Day observance which is being duplicated by millions throughout our land and in several foreign countries.

To make the point clear the following facts must be considered: There are more than 1 million names on the honor rolls of the American war dead. These names are the men and women who have fought and died for our country since this Nation was founded some 185 years ago.

vital public expenditures could be met. But if the cost is higher than our present level of public spending, I frankly believe that education and health for our children, dignity and beauty in our civic lives, and security and well-being in the world at large are more important than the "things" which might otherwise have priority.

But still more important is America's need to face squarely the facts about its situation. If freedom is really the organizing principle of our society, then we cannot forget that it is not illusion, propaganda and sedatives, but truth, and truth alone, that makes us free.

Under the influence of the politics of sedation and the techniques of salesmanship, I believe that in recent years self-deceit has slackened our grip on reality. We have tended to shirk the difficult truth and accept the easy half-truth. Perhaps it is always that way. As the old humorist Josh Billings used to say:

"As scarce as truth is, the supply has always been in excess of the demand."

ENTAILS HARD CHOICES

But we know from our own lives that reality entails hard choices and disappointments: that it measures real achievement not in terms of luck but in terms of difficulties overcome. I don't believe our national life can follow any other pattern.

No preordained destiny decrees that America shall have all the breaks and soft options. Neither greatness nor even freedom lies that way. So we must surely return to the reality principle, to the bracing, invigorating, upland climate of truth itself. I think we are ready now to move forward into the rigors and glories of the new decade with open eyes, eager step and firm purposes worthy of our great past.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR OF THIS ARTICLE

Adlai Ewing Stevenson, Democrat, was twice a candidate for the Presidency, opposing Dwight D. Eisenhower, Republican.

Mr. Stevenson was born in Los Angeles in 1900. He received his bachelor's degree from Princeton in 1922 and his law degree from Northwestern University in 1926.

After practicing law in Chicago, he was assistant to the Secretary of the Navy from 1941 to 1944, assistant to the Secretary of State in 1945, and U.S. delegate to the United Nations General Assembly in 1946 and 1947.

He served as Governor of Illinois from 1949 to 1953.

Mr. Stevenson is now practicing law in Chicago. He is trustee or director of various educational and philanthropic organizations. He is the author of "Call to Greatness," published in 1954, and "What I Think," 1956.

CONSCIENCE DEMANDS MEDICAL CARE FOR OUR SENIOR CITIZENS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I am sure that we do not think of ourselves as a Nation without a heart, or a Congress without a conscience. Still, in the minds of millions of older Americans, such as the woman who wrote a letter, which I now submit, this is what we have become. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that her letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: I am writing to see if something can be done for the older citizens who must rely on social security and old-age pensions for a living. I am very grateful to a good President, Franklin Roosevelt, who had heart enough to think of old people. However, since that became law the cost of living has gone up so very

high that the older folks do not get even the necessary things to make their lives comfortable. They do not have the medical care they need because hospital and doctors' fees are so high, not to mention drugs.

I think it is wrong for a country like ours to forget their old people who have helped make America the great country that it is and I think they should have the comforts of life before we send money for other country's people.

ARMENIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this coming Saturday marks the independence day of Armenia. This is an anniversary of great patriotic significance to Armenian people throughout the world, but it unfortunately cannot be celebrated in the Armenian homeland as it will be observed by Armenian-Americans and Armenian peoples elsewhere in the world. The Armenian Republic was established and recognized by the United States in 1920. But it maintained itself as a sovereign nation for only a few months, before the armed might of Soviet Russia overwhelmed the nation and overthrew the independent Armenian Government. In the same year of 1920, the Soviet Union proclaimed the Soviet Republic of Armenia, and the homeland of the Armenians remains within the Soviet Union today. In February of 1921, Armenian patriots fought a valiant and temporarily successful rebellion against the Soviets, but in a matter of months, reinforced Russian troops again took over the nation.

In our own country, the Americans who comprise the Armenian community have a deep understanding and appreciation of the heritage of freedom and democracy which perhaps too many Americans sometimes take for granted. They or their descendants have fled their homeland to escape brutal invaders or tyrannous dictators. Their contribution to our American political and social tradition and to our general culture has been great. Their opposition to communism has been monumental and soundly rooted. Armenian-Americans are anxious now to see the reestablishment of an independent, democratic Armenia. It is appropriate that Americans therefore join with their fellow citizens of Armenian descent in recognizing the significance of this independence date, and in supporting their hopes for the reestablishment of a free, democratic Armenia.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIRE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

SOURCES OF NATIONAL PRIDE

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the effort at the summit has come and gone. It failed, as many thought it would, and

as some hoped it would not. But as we look back on the Paris meeting and the events surrounding it, I believe that the American people can be proud of two things that emerged.

First, we have a great source of pride in our President. In the face of a bullying and scurrilous attack by the leader of the forces who will, as long as they exist, make any summit an impossibility, President Eisenhower maintained a calm dignity and a restraint which a weaker man could not have achieved. He proved again that there are in his heart a passion and a desire for peace that we have not seen equaled in our lifetime. It was this simple badge of honesty and decency that accentuated the vileness of Khrushchev's attack, and made clear to the world that the real obstacle to peace is the Soviet Communists—not the Soviet people, but their leaders.

Our second source of pride is the achievement of the CIA in the instance of the U-2. Frankly, my confidence in this Agency was never too high; but this achievement has caused my opinion toward it to soar tremendously. Those whose typewriters have been punching through a dark ribbon of gloom relative to our lack of intelligence of our enemy must now be amazed at what actually has been going on in this field, as I feel most Americans must be. Our amazement is coupled with pride as we gather the secure feeling that we have been obtaining knowledge of the enemy at a rate and of a quality that surpasses our greatest hopes. To the CIA and to the Lockheed Aircraft Co., to the men who flew the U-2, and to their ground crews must go the undying gratitude and respect of the American people. I detect more, by far, of a feeling such as this, than the feeling expressed by others—others who would apologize to the bully; who suggest it was the fault of the United States that the summit failed; who continue to be afraid of the Soviet and would yield West Berlin to the tyrants. Thank God that those timid souls are in the complete minority in our land, and that the majority of Americans feel more secure in the knowledge gained by this program; knowledge that makes lies out of much that the Communists and their sympathizers in our land would have us believe; knowledge, for example, that the Soviet cannot, as they have boasted, shoot down any aircraft flying over their heartland, regardless of speed of altitude; knowledge that our deterrent force of more than 2,000 bombers, including 1,400 B-47's and 550 B-52's, could fly against their obviously limited air defenses with success; knowledge that, by the same token, our carrier-based aircraft could carry out attacks 1,000 miles into the Soviet Union; knowledge that some 1,000 fighter bombers located around the periphery of the Soviet borders could drop atomic or TNT bombs from 500 to 1,000 miles within that country. This is intelligence developed from the flights of the U-2 and from other sources, and it is something we should be proud of, and not ashamed of.

I am disturbed that some of my colleagues have thought it wise to instigate

an investigation into this entire matter. To me what the CIA has done was something that had to be done, and it is as integral a part of national defense as the weapon in the hands of a soldier. One of the first tenets of war is to know what your enemy has and what he might do with it. This is what the CIA and the military were trying to do, and what they should always be trying to do. To me this is the duty of the intelligence gathering agencies, and not the business of some committee of Congress. To be sure, it would be a closed-door investigation, but all of us here know that there are hundreds of ways for what goes on behind closed doors to become the property of the press, the radio, the TV, our people, and, I might add, the Soviets. I am hopeful that those who, in the heat of developments, called for this inquiry will, in the interest of the country, see that it does not proceed. Gathering intelligence of what the other fellow is doing is practiced by business, by labor organizations; yes, even by some husbands and some wives. It is not new. It is not novel. It must go on at the national level, and we, as a branch of our Government, should not make more difficult a task which is always a hard one.

The President's suggestion, made again last evening on TV, that the United States institute a system of worldwide surveillance so that every country could know what every other country is up to militarily, coincides with a similar one I made on this floor last week. I urge that it be done with any equipment we have, and I hope we will utilize not only surveillance missiles but the B-70, with its 80,000-foot-plus, 2,100-mile-an-hour capability.

Today the errors committed are far outweighed by the successes achieved. Instead of carping at our mistakes, we should forget them and devote our efforts to stimulating a national pride in the two successes we have—our President's actions in face of the enemy and our tremendously expanded knowledge of the enemy's abilities achieved through the U-2.

GOVERNOR ROCKEFELLER DELIVERS CHALLENGING ADDRESS ON AMERICA'S THIRD CENTURY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, at a meeting of the World Affairs Council of Philadelphia on April 22 Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, of New York, delivered the first of a series of four addresses on major issues confronting the people of the United States. The title of this address was "The Third Century," its reference being to the fact that the third century of our history as a nation is opening before us.

Governor Rockefeller reviewed the historical background in which we enter this new century, and he stressed the tremendous area of challenge that lies before us on this threshold of a new era. In view of the stirring nature of this address, of its significance in terms of our spiritual growth as a nation, and in terms of our position of leadership responsibility in the world of freemen, I ask unanimous consent that the address

and the transcript of the ensuing question-and-answer period be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address and questions and answers were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE THIRD CENTURY—A CONCEPT OF AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

(By Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, of New York)

In this city so profoundly linked in fact and in memory with the birth of America, I appeal to history to remind us plainly, as a people, where we stand, for what we stand, where we may fall, where we dare not fall, but must prevail.

I shall state the matter of the moment as gravely as I see it.

It rises from the very history and heritage and character of the American people.

As a people, we have cherished and respected basic spiritual and religious beliefs and values proclaiming the supreme worth of the individual.

Our beliefs about individual man have been rooted in the profound and priceless truths of Judaism and Christianity.

These truths define man as the supreme creature of God. They therefore proclaim the individual the supremely valuable being on earth, and the free fulfillment of his destiny the supreme purpose of life itself.

No state can decree this fulfillment: God alone could do that. No state can define this destiny: man alone can do that.

Brother to all men and the servant of none, the free individual is gifted with a life whose laws and standards and purposes stand above, not beneath, the state.

And the true role of the state, therefore, is to respect and to serve the matchless dignity of the individual.

Our forefathers in the middle of the 18th century realized that their hopes and aspirations for the fulfillment of man could not be achieved in the political world in which they found themselves.

Hence they moved to the historic achievement of creating in the form of the American Nation a political structure within which this deep belief in the worth of the individual, and these spiritual values, could flourish and find fulfillment.

This action was destined to inspire the dynamic political forces of democracy throughout the world.

These values and beliefs were themselves not national but universal. And as the heritage of the people themselves, these principles have forever inspired us to reach out beyond the framework of our own Nation.

Accordingly, through the ensuing decades, we as a people have given testimony by our deeds to the values we cherish and to our concern for humanity at large.

We have done this in many and changing ways: in things religious, through missionaries to distant lands; in things social, through charities and foundations; in things economic, through aid and comfort to the needy and afflicted; in things military, through lives given in defense of freedom.

This has been the history and this has been the nature of our life as a people.

Two centuries after the creative work of our Founding Fathers, the formidable fact is now emerging that these principles of individual freedom and individual worth can live and achieve universal application only if we join with other peoples to create larger political structures binding many nations in common purpose.

If we fail to do this, in this mid-20th century, we will risk not merely national peril in a conventional sense; we will risk the death of those values that inspire the struggle for human dignity and freedom throughout the world.

The task, then, is truly momentous. It is nothing less than this: to match the politi-

cal creativity of our forefathers by devising new institutions, new associations of nations, that can give all the world the same tangible hope for the realization of freedom that our forefathers gave to a single nation.

In the 18th century, we succeeded as a people because we had a clear sense of purpose and dedication. In the 20th century we have not yet succeeded as a people because we have lacked that singleness of purpose and dedication—and instead we have improvised.

In the 18th century, we, the American people, had an idea of man that inspired and governed our action and conduct as a people. In the 20th century, we have too rarely, too casually, related our actions to that idea—with the result that our national conduct has been inspired less by our own beliefs than by the threats of others.

In the 18th century, we knew that our idea of man to be realized had to be translated into concrete and specific political forms and institutions. In the 20th century, we have tried largely to substitute military acts or economic acts for the vital and lacking political acts of creation.

The full gravity of our position in the world today can be summarized in simple questions.

If it has become possible for Communists to twist and distort our very ideas of democracy and freedom and justice—and to exploit these words as if they were their own—is this not plain proof that somehow we ourselves have failed to give these ideas vital and convincing expression?

If the Communists seem forever ingenious and inventive in promoting chaos, is not their apparent skill at least partly, perhaps largely, a reflection of our failure to promote order?

If the Communists have success in waging political and psychological war, is not their success greatly due to our failure to create larger political structures in which freedom can flourish?

If communism has an appeal to newly emerging peoples as a way of life bordering on a religion, is it not because we have failed to give content to our concepts of brotherly love and human dignity in our preoccupation with material success?

The conclusion seems to me as clear as it is crucial.

We cannot successfully serve the cause of freedom in the 20th century with devices less bold, with dedication less fervent, with purpose less clear than in the 18th century.

What is needed to serve the dignity and freedom of the individual in many nations can hardly be less than what was needed in one nation.

In the revolutionary times through which we pass, we shall be the creators of circumstance—or we shall be its victims. And the issue will turn not upon how well we can counter the thrusts and inventions of others—but how well we can express and convey our own conviction.

To carry such conviction on the world scene demands of us the same two creative achievements of which the American people proved themselves capable two centuries ago.

We must bind our acts as a people firmly to our idea of man, the free individual.

And, working with other peoples and nations, we must translate this idea into political forms and institutions, so that the idea becomes not only right but also relevant for the lives of free peoples everywhere.

We face in the world a kind of political wilderness in which the hopes for freedom of all peoples may be lost.

The scene is more challenging and perilous than the wilderness the American people confronted two centuries ago.

We can do no less than match them and their vision.

We must be pioneers once again—political pioneers—pioneers of peace.

an Atlantic convention to explore the possibilities of bringing the people, bordering on the Atlantic, closer together? I understand such a proposal is now before Congress."

Governor Rockefeller: "Do I support the idea advocated by Justice Owen Roberts on many occasions in this room of bringing together the nations bordering on the Atlantic Ocean?"

"I do, providing we include our friends to the south. I feel very strongly that one of the great traditions in the free association of nations and people has been the Western Hemisphere tradition of the Pan American Union. It was the concept of Simon Bolivar that as the old world empires broke up, something had to take their place; and he advocated that these free nations associate in the common interest—working together to develop a structure that would take the place of empires in the world. I think, myself, that it was one of the great concepts—comparable in a sense to the concept of our own founding fathers—and he was looking far into the future. I do feel that a conference, such as the one you mentioned, would be very useful, but I would like to see us consider, as members of the Atlantic community, the Western Hemisphere nations, all of them, bordering on the Atlantic."

Question: "Do you think that it is possible that these regional groupings might get together into full federations, at some time in the future?"

Governor Rockefeller: "I would think, myself, that that would be, at some point, a very logical conclusion. Certainly the experience of the United States has been one of the most exciting and thrilling in the history of the world. I know that some of us are concerned about States rights, and we do our best to preserve them. Yet I think the Federal system has proven its tremendous strength and vitality. So I do not see why—where regions exist with compatible objectives on the part of the people—they should not ultimately lead to confederation."

Question: "Do you have a word for us on China?"

Governor Rockefeller: "Do I have a word for you on China? For us—or for the Soviets or for the free nations in Asia—China presents a fantastic problem. I think that we have got to be continually looking ahead. We have to be trying to find how we can get ourselves into a position of initiative—and not into a position of stalemate—with that group of extraordinarily able people of brilliant people with a great history, with a great civilization in back of them. China cannot be written off. Now the process of how we do this—how we get from where we are to where we need to be with respect to China, while being always faithful to our basic beliefs—this is one of the great challenges which this Nation and our allies face."

"Thank you very much indeed. I appreciate your coming."

THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS ON THE SUMMIT CONFERENCE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the President delivered a temperate report to the American people last night on the circumstances surrounding the U-2 incident, the stillborn summit meeting, and the present state of his foreign policy with respect to Soviet Russia. He emphasized once again what is clear to all who will see that, in our own interests, in the interests of humanity, the search for a durable peace must go on despite this setback. His administration, he stressed, will continue to nego-

tiate with the Communists on disarmament, nuclear testing, and other matters of vital importance to the entire world.

In that respect he put the basic problem of our foreign policy in a true perspective. The problem is to get the world out of the corner into which it has painted itself with the brush of mutual terror. This problem can be dealt with only by "reason and common-sense," to use the President's words. It will hardly be dealt with by political debate which seeks to prove the relative degree of hardness or softness toward communism of presidential candidates of either party. Along with the rest of the world we are walking too close to the edge of universal chaos and destruction to support that childish game any longer. We will either choose our next President on the basis of character, integrity, maturity, and wisdom, or all of us, regardless of party, will pay the terrible price.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. I commend the distinguished acting majority leader for his comments. The Nation listened to the President last night. They listened to him speak as an American, who expressed the goals and hopes and prayers of the American people. He went to Paris as our American leader.

I believe that in the coming election the representatives of both the Democratic Party and the Republican Party who stand before the people as candidates for President and Vice President of the United States will be in agreement with respect to the sharing of the basic goal of the American people.

There will be no reason for Republicans to accuse Democrats or for Democrats to accuse Republicans of being soft on Communists because, Mr. President, as you and I and the Senate—and the country—agree that our goal is peace with justice in the world. There is no partisanship or politics in that hope. We all share it. As the able acting majority leader said the other day, we are all in this boat together.

I have the same feeling with respect to the comments of our Chief Executive last night that the distinguished junior Senator from Montana has. The President spoke as frankly as he could. He spoke temperately and with courage and with commendable frankness. He indicated once again not only our ever-ready willingness and our earnest desire to negotiate with the Soviet to try to find a way for enforceable nuclear test bans, for enforceable disarmament agreements, and for the peaceful and honorable settlement of those other painful problems which hang darkly over all the world. The President reflected the views of a united America in his statement of last night.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from California. I wish to say that this shibboleth of being soft on communism, in my opinion, applies neither to the Republican Party nor to the Democratic Party.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, speaking as an American rather than as a member of either party, I wish to compliment the junior Senator from Montana for his constant temperance in these trying days. His has been a voice which has spoken out continuously for the proper American approach to a problem which involves all of us as Americans rather than as Democrats or Republicans.

Mr. President, I am hopeful that in the coming days of the campaign the same restraint which has been practiced by the distinguished junior Senator from Montana will be practiced by the candidates of both parties and by the conventions of both parties.

Mr. President, this is not a political matter. When the United States is threatened by an enemy, the American people solidify behind their leader.

Mr. President, I am happy to report that in my travels around the United States since the incident of the U-2 plane I have found a great admiration and a great respect for the President. I find the American people are solidly united behind him and solidly in favor of the program which produced the U-2 plane and which will produce any other system of espionage whereby the U.S. Government, its intelligence agencies and its military services, can acquire intelligence of the intentions of and the abilities of the Soviets. It is to me, Mr. President, as I believe it is to the majority of Americans, this intelligence, this knowing of the capabilities of our enemies and the probable action of our enemies, which is the most vital thing we have confronting us today as an object to be achieved.

Once again, Mr. President, I salute the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] for his constant temperance in the field of foreign relations and for his constant efforts to see that the best interests of America are served before those of his own party or of the party in opposition.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I wish to join in the commendation of the distinguished Senator from Montana, the acting majority leader, for the remarks he has made. It is typical of the attitude which he has displayed from the outset in this crisis. His commendation of the President for his address last evening is typical of the very fine attitude displayed by our friend from Montana.

The address of the President of the United States seemed to me to be a clear affirmation of America's determination to stand firm and a definite indication that this attitude of firmness will continue. I think his address will inspire confidence in our national defenses, particularly in our intelligence-gathering apparatus.

I was particularly impressed by the fact that the President devoted a considerable part of his address to and ended his address by looking toward the

May 26

10344

future, which is something we all must do, regardless of anything which may have happened in the past. He clearly outlined some of the steps we should take, including particularly his intention to assist the United Nations in making available equipment for satellite reconnaissance.

I do not know what has been the experience of other Members of this body, but my mail has reflected a very great change in the attitude of the people who have communicated with me over the period since the initial incident took place. This was, of course, before the President made his address. Originally there apparently was a feeling on the part of many that there had been a great blunder made and that this had seriously damaged our Nation. More recently there has been an overwhelming indication in the mail which I have received in support of the position taken by our Government. Upon thoughtful reflection, for the most part, Americans think this is a sound position.

In the minds of nearly all of these people, the onus for scuttling the summit conference rests solely on Mr. Khrushchev. His motives, of course, are not positively known but events make very clear that Mr. Khrushchev came to Paris with the fixed intention to scuttle the conference and if the U-2 incident had not been seized as a pretext, something else would have been.

Like the distinguished Senator from Montana, I found the address of the President informative, clear, and couched in dignified, nonpartisan language. That same high level characterized the Senator's remarks this morning, in which he joined with Americans of all parties in expressing the sentiments that we face this situation together and shall continue to do so, and also shall continue to maintain without partisan consideration those policies of firmness and strength which alone assume a lasting and a just peace.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Like the Senator from Montana, I can find, and did find, praiseworthy elements in President Eisenhower's speech last evening. I was glad to note his proposal to cooperate with the United Nations. I was pleased to hear him say that he favored businesslike negotiations with the Soviet Union, and that these must continue.

The lack of careful summit preparations—the agreement to hold a summit conference without precise understandings as to what would be discussed, in what context, and what agreements were likely or possible to be reached—were, according to all of the diplomatic experience of the United States, unbusinesslike in character. Personal diplomacy failed; summitry failed. They failed in part because they were unbusinesslike. Would the Senator from Montana agree with that?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would say, in response to the question raised by the

Senator from Tennessee, on the basis of the record which he made in the asking of questions in the Foreign Relations Committee, that there is ground to state there was not enough, perhaps, in the way of preparation, plans, or procedures. I think the record will bear out that statement, from the colloquy which took place between the Senator from Tennessee and the Secretary of State at a hearing before the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. GORE. As I have stated, though there were commendable parts, commendable elements, in the President's statement, I must be frank to say I did not think the President in the speech last night faced up to the extremes in ineptitude which resulted, in part, in the worst diplomatic debacle which human experience affords.

The President made general reference to an initial covering statement with respect to the U-2 flight. I ask the Senator from Montana if he regards the later statement by the State Department as a so-called covering statement. On May 6 Mr. Lincoln White, of the State Department, said:

There was no deliberate attempt to violate Soviet airspace and there never has been.

SERVING OF OLEOMARGARINE OR MARGARINE IN NAVY RATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2168) to amend the Navy ration statute so as to provide for the serving of oleomargarine or margarine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 10:30 a.m. having arrived, the Senate, under its order of yesterday, will now proceed to the consideration of the Proxmire-Prouty amendment to S. 2168 under limitation of debate and control of time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the morning hour be extended for 5 minutes, and that the 5 minutes be added to the time, if necessary, on the debate on the Proxmire-Prouty amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair informs the Senator from Montana that 12:30 p.m. has been fixed as a time certain for voting upon the amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] if he will grant me 2 minutes under the time which he controls?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIRE in the chair). Two minutes are yielded to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I believe the Senator completed his question. I do not know definitely, but I would question that this was a covering statement. May I say to the Senator that the President at the White House conference this morning expressed his full and wholehearted approval of the inquiry which is to be undertaken tomorrow by the Committee on Foreign Relations, of which the distinguished Senator from Tennessee is a member, and which is

under the chairmanship of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

Mr. GORE. I am glad the President has given his approval. The many questions unanswered leave the Senate committee no choice but to try diligently and earnestly to inform the American people. It is only by demonstrating to the world that we are determined to learn from our mistakes and correct them that we can demonstrate the will of this great Nation to follow a path of rectitude, moral strength, and correct policy. As a member of the committee—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield 1 additional minute?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. One minute additional is yielded to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. GORE. As a member of the committee, I will participate with my distinguished colleague to this end.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in reply, I agree with what the Senator from Tennessee has just said. He has always been frank in his comments. He has always been reasonable and constructive in his attitudes, and I feel that much in the way of benefits could be derived from this hearing, which will be conducted by the Foreign Relations Committee. I commend the Senator from Tennessee for his remarks not only today but on previous occasions as well. We are all indebted to him because he has, over the years, made many real and valuable contributions to our foreign policy and our security. He has proved to his colleagues that he is a man of conviction, knowledge, and deep understanding.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Wisconsin if he will yield 2 minutes?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in connection with all the world comments which we are hearing on the President's address, I believe one thing must be made clear. This address, coupled with the historic event opening tomorrow of the hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee, and the continuing hearings before the Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery, of which I have the honor to be a member, gives an unparalleled opportunity to show the world our society operating at its best. Because, rarely in history has any statesman talked to the people of the United States as the President did last night. He spoke with great frankness, laying it on the line as to where we were wrong and where we were right.

I have little doubt the same position will feature the testimony released by the Foreign Relations Committee. The subcommittee of which I am a member is holding a hearing with George Kennan in public and at which I am sure there will be a most thorough airing of the policymaking machinery aspects of this whole difficult situation in which we found ourselves such a short time ago.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

RECONNAISSANCE SATELLITES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in a speech that I made in 1958 I proposed that when we developed reconnaissance satellites we should make the information gathered from the satellites available to the United Nations.

As we all know, the United States on Tuesday, May 24, launched the first reconnaissance satellite, just at a time when tensions in the world are at a boiling point. We can take the lead now in easing the paralytic mistrust and suspicion which pervades the present world atmosphere by voting before the United Nations and offering to that body the information gathered from what will eventually be a fleet of reconnaissance satellites. Surely, there could be no more concrete and dramatic way of effectively demonstrating to the community of nations our willingness to disarm the international atmosphere with

such a fleet of satellites encircling the globe, the United Nations would always know whether any nation was planning a surprise attack.

The reconnaissance satellite has within its technical facilities one of the great defensive and protective mechanisms for the United States of America insofar as the danger of surprise attack is concerned.

If the Soviet Union accepts our plan in the U.N. line, and the world is better off. If it vetoes our proposal, it is unmasked before world public opinion as a disruptive influence in peaceful relations among nations.

It is such a proposal as this, for a reconnaissance satellite as a means of really policing, so to speak, the open skies, and policing the Earth's surface, which offers a great opportunity for world peace and offers an opportunity for American initiative in the United Nations in the search for world peace.

Mansfield Absolves President in 'Spying'

Senator Mansfield, Democrat of Montana, the assistant Senate majority leader, said last night "the President is blameless" in the acknowledged Soviet spying episode but warned that Congress will expect an explanation of the affair.

He said in an interview that whatever was done was done without the knowledge of President Eisenhower, but added, "Under our system of government, the administration in power does bear a great responsibility."

Senator Mansfield said the State Department's announcement suggests "There may be an agency or agencies in the Government who are acting on their own responsibility, contrary to the President's policies for peace." If this is so, Senator Mansfield continued, "I would assume that the Pres-

ident . . . will have some searching questions to ask . . ." He continued:

"I believe that the Congress will not only expect an explanation based on the President's inquiry, but it is quite possible there will be questions asked in the Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees."

Senator Mansfield would not name the agency or agencies which might be responsible.

Senator Sparkman, Democrat of Alabama, a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, earlier yesterday said, "I certainly don't believe" the account of the plane episode given by Soviet Premier Khrushchev, but after the State Department announcement said: "I think the only thing to do is admit the facts and let our people know what the true situation is."

LEGISLATORS WOULD AVOID 'SPY' INQUIRY

Some Congressmen Gravely Concerned Over Incident

Washington, May 8 (AP)—United States admission that an American spy plane flew into Russia brought reaction from Congress today ranging from grave concern to a so-what attitude.

There were no ringing demands that Congress do anything except get more details behind closed doors. The view of some members was that it's best for Congress to keep quiet now in the face of a ticklish situation.

Some members, especially Democrats, expressed concern about what effect the affair might have on the East-West summit meeting scheduled to start May 16 in Paris.

Senator Sparkman (D., Ala.), a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, said he wants to know more about how Francis G. Powers, the captured 30-year-old pilot, happened to fly into Russia.

He said he hopes all Government agencies involved "will give a full disclosure of what took place."

State Department "Candid"

Everett M. Dirksen of Illinois, Senate Republican leader, took a different view. He said yesterday's State Department was candid in explaining what happened and "I don't think any issue can be taken with it."

Dirksen, like others, said it is "part of reality" that each nation watch out for its own security and keep an eye on any violations of that security.

He reiterated, as the State Department had pointed out, that it is normal for all nations, including the Soviet Union, to carry on intelligence activity.

Senator Wiley of Wisconsin, senior Republican on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, took a similar view.

"We know that Russia has got spies all over the world," he said. "The West can't afford to fall asleep and it hasn't fallen asleep."

Red Sub Mentioned

Asserting that Russia has had submarines off the United States and South American coasts, Wiley asked: "What for? We know the Russians, as well as we, don't want a third world war."

"We had our lesson in Pearl Harbor and we can't afford to have a second lesson like that," Wiley said.

The characterization of a grave situation was made by Lyndon B. Johnson of Texas, Senate Democratic leader. He said:

"We must understand we are involved in a crisis in the making." Two other senators, campaigning in West Virginia for the Democratic Presidential nomination, also viewed the "situation" as serious.

Senator Kennedy of Massachusetts said the plane incident "indicates how hazardous are our relations with the Soviet Union."

Senator Humphrey of Minnesota said:

"Whatever the facts may be, Mr. Khrushchev had better recognize that force is not the way to settle international disputes."

U.S. "Slowly Slipping"

Another seeker after the Democratic Presidential nomination, Senator Symington of Missouri, commented that "we are slowly slipping in our position around the world" while people compare our strength with that of the Soviet Union.

Representative Bowles (D., Conn.) called the flight irresponsible and reckless and said it was an error at this time even to allow an American plane to get close enough to the Soviet border to be shot down.

Bowles said the incident would make it more difficult to deal with the Russians at the summit.

Sparkman too said it is "unfortunate that this excursion was made, if it was made, on the eve of the summit meeting. It must have compromised our position."

But Dirksen said he doesn't expect the incident to have any great effect at the summit.